

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIII. No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1808. [PRICE 10D.

From a Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, printed in 1802, the following item stands on the credit side of the Civil List. "By amount of sums advanced to His Royal Highness, the Duke of York, which is to be repaid by instalments of £1,000 quarterly, from 1st Jan. 1805, £54,000. 17. 6." So that, it appears, from this document, that the Duke of York has drawn this large sum of money from the public purse, over and above his pensions, pay, and allowances; and that, according to the statement of the Report, the repayment (which was not to begin until three years after the advance was made) is to be so slow, that the interest, at 5 per centum, will swallow up five eighths of the principal.

257]

[258

TO
WILLIAM ROSCOE, Esq.
LETTER II.

SIR,

Upon reverting to the subject of the Negotiation of 1806, I cannot, upon reading your remarks a second time, forbear taking some notice of the curious "incident," which appears to have led to the opening of that negotiation, namely, the tender of his services made by an assassin to Mr. Fox. This was, indeed, a curious "incident;" and yet, somehow or other, it has happened, that there never was an incident that gave rise to less conversation, in public, or in private. It was a thing, which, as it were by compact, all men were in the mind to pass over in silence. As to myself, I will tell you flatly and plainly, that I looked upon the whole as being a matter of mere contrivance, as completely as any "incident" of a play-house piece; and, the reason why I never said this before, was, that Mr. Fox being dead, I felt a repugnance at commenting upon the part, which he had had the weakness to act; which repugnance is now outweighed by the considerations arising from the evident motives, whence you have set forward this almost forgotten incident. The story of the incident is this: a person makes shift to get from France to England "without a passport," a very extraordinary thing in itself; but hither he comes, and, going to Mr. Fox, tells him, that a scheme had been formed for killing Napoleon, at Passy, attended with neither risk nor uncertainty. Mr. Fox drives him from his presence; but orders him to be kept in custody of the police, until the French government be informed of the matter, which information is given by Mr. Fox to Mr. Talleyrand, in a letter dated on the 20th of February, 1806; and, when it becomes pretty certain, that the information is received in France, and, of course, that measures are taken to defeat the intention of the assassin and his colleagues of Passy, the assassin is sent off

out of the kingdom. This letter of Mr. Fox brings him one from Mr. Talleyrand Perigord, formerly Bishop of Autun, and one of the guardians of the holy oil, which had been kept in a bottle at Rheims, ever since the coronation of Charlemagne. The Bishop conveys to Mr. Fox the thanks of his imperial and royal majesty, Napoleon, and, at the same time, gives him, in the way of "news," an extract from the Emperor's speech to his legislators, about peace; this, accompanied with a hint from Mr. Talleyrand, upon the same topic, leads to a negotiation in form. But, first let us, since you will have it so, inquire a little into the probabilities of the plot at Passy. First, it is, as was before remarked, not a little extraordinary, that any one should, without the consent, or connivance, of the French government, get from France to Gravesend. Where was he to embark? On board of what? How was he to pass unmolested? Secondly, upon the supposition, that the plot was really formed, the house taken at Passy, and the preparations for the murder all duly made, how came Mr. Talleyrand not to let Mr. Fox know whether the thing had been discovered, or what had been the result of that inquiry, to which Mr. Fox's letter would naturally have led? Thirdly, how comes it that we have never heard the Moniteur say any thing upon the subject, which was one of great public interest; and how comes it, too, that neither the envoy of the assassins, nor any one of the band, has ever been brought to justice? Mr. Fox certainly did not act as I should have done. I should have looked upon the man as sent from France, in the same manner that Méhée de la Touche was; I should have had him confined, and strictly examined; and, should, in the meanwhile, have informed the French government, that, unless it could be clearly proved, that preparations for assassination had actually been made at Passy, the envoy would be considered as a spy, and very soon hanged in that capacity. This is what I

[261]

address proposed by Lord Howick. After an eulogium on Mr. Whitbread's speech, upon that occasion, you say, in a tone of lamentation mixed with anger, "yet, the motion of Mr. Whitbread" (which softened the asperity of that of Lord Howick) "was negatived without a division." And, whose fault was that? Why, it was the fault of your pacific ministry. It was the fault of those very men, whose elevation to power, you tell us gave the people a confident expectation of peace, and whose fall you tell us, deprived the people of all hope of peace. Not altogether, indeed, was it their fault; for, though they had a decided majority in St. Stephen's, yet, the "negative without a division" was not their fault, but *your* fault, and every man's fault, who disapproved of breaking off the negotiation. It was in your power to divide the House. It required no knack at speaking for an hour at a time. A single syllable, distinctly pronounced, would have been sufficient; and, if you refrained from making so slight an effort to serve the cause of peace then, when your party was in power, what credit is due to your professions now? A negotiation is broken off upon grounds, which you represent as feigned; the enemy, you say, offers satisfactory terms of peace; our ministers come to parliament with an assertion that a continuation of the war is rendered unavoidable by the injustice and ambition of the enemy; you now say that this assertion was false; and yet, oh, patriotic gentleman; "real friend of mankind;" and great enemy to "the tragedy of war!" What do you do? Sit, at the back of the minister, like a mouse in a cheese; say not a word; give your silent assent to what you now say was a false assertion; but, the ministry being changed, and the new ministry having ousted you from your seat in parliament, you come forth in a pamphlet and say that, which you ought to have said in your place in parliament; you now address to faction and distress, that which you ought to have addressed to the public spirit and reason of the nation. Upon the supposition that you were incapable of speaking (which is not, however, the fact, you having spoken, in all, six times); upon this supposition, or upon the supposition that your talents and faculties are of that peculiar sort which are not to be brought to bear against a minister, to whom you are looking up for emoluments and honours; upon this supposition, which is the most favourable to you that I can conceive, why did you not bring out your

pamphlet at an earlier period? The time for it to have been useful was immediately after the parliamentary discussion, above referred to; and, if that had been, from your great duties as a law-giver, let slip, you surely might have published it after you were happily disburthened of that charge. But, no; you stop till the rupture of the negotiation has produced all its mischiefs; you stop, in short, until the very hour, when you think that your pamphlet, joined to the distresses in the manufacturing districts, will have a chance of producing an effect hostile to the party, to whose superior cunning you owe your fall as a public man. You now affect to lament the consequences of the rupture of the negotiation; you now display before the public its terrible effects upon the North of Europe, seeming to suppose, that we should forget, that no small part of those effects had been already produced, when the discussion in parliament took place. In short, it is as clear as noon day, that of what you have now said, against the breaking off of the negotiation, not one word would, in any way, have been said by you, if the late ministry had remained in power, and if you had remained in parliament. Such a person it becomes to be cautious how he accuses others of a want of principle.

It is true, however, that what has here been said has little to do with the question itself, though it may, by exposing your conduct and motives, be useful in counteracting your designs. The ministers might be much to blame for breaking off the negotiation, though you could not discover it, until they were out of place, and though, so far from appearing to discover it in due time, you, with all the information before you, gave your silent assent to a solemn proceeding, the purpose of which was to give to their conduct the stamp of public approbation. To come to a decision upon the merits of the case itself, we must now take a view of those "satisfactory terms," which were offered by France, during the negotiation of 1806. These terms were: that Hanover was to be restored to the king, Malta, the Cape of Good Hope, the French possessions in the East Indies, and Tobago, in the West Indies, were to be left in our hands; while the only condition which France asked in return was, that we should leave her the absolute mistress of every port upon the continent of Europe, those of Russia, Sweden, and Denmark excepted, the island of Sicily being to be surrendered to her, and the king of that country being to be made a pensioner of

Spain. "Hanover for the honour of the crown, Malta for the honour of the navy, and the Cape of Good Hope for the honour of commerce." This was the ingenious arrangement of Mr. Talleyrand, of whom you seem to be an humble pupil; for you, too, tell us, that the terms offered by France were "such as might have satisfied both the honour of the sovereign and the expectations of the British ministry," had not their "determination not to desert our Russian ally prevented such terms from being accepted." As a proof of the truth of this assertion of yours, you refer to the declaration of Lord Lauderdale, that the arrangement contended for, by us, in favour of Russia, "was considered as an object, *more interesting, if possible,* to England, than those points which might be considered as peculiarly connected with her own interests;" and, in confirmation, you quote the King's Declaration, recently made with regard to Russia, in which the Czar is reminded, that "the negotiation of 1806 was broken off upon points, *immediately* affecting, *not his majesty's own interests*, but those of his imperial ally." Upon the strength of these declarations you assert that the war, after the negotiation of 1806, was "continued for interests *not our own*," leaving out, with your usual fairness, all the qualifications accompanying the expression, in both declarations. Lord Lauderdale only says, that the arrangement desired for Russia was an object "*more interesting*," than those points peculiarly connected with our own interests; and he adds, "*if possible*;" clearly implying that those points were of themselves of very great interest. And, in the king's recent declaration, the word "*immediately*" so qualifies what follows, as to give to the declaration a meaning not at all different from that of Lord Lauderdale, which meaning plainly is, that, though, as to the interests of England, there were great differences, yet, it happened, that it was upon points more immediately connected with the interests of Russia, that the negotiation was broken off. But, to have adhered to the fair construction of these declarations would not have suited your purpose, which was to bring your readers gradually to the following clenching argument: "that, as the non-compliance by France with our demands, on the part of Russia, was the *only* reason for continuing the war, there exists not *now*, when that reason is effectually removed by the avowed hostility against us, either any just ground of offence against France

"for her conduct in this transaction, or any difference of interest between the two countries, which can now be alledged as a motive for continuing the war;" an argument, which might have done honour to counsellor Bramble or counsellor Botherem, but which one would have expected to be scorned by a man putting forward such high pretensions to fairness and integrity; for, to say nothing more of the false premises upon which you proceed, who, above the level of a journeyman callico-weaver, does not perceive, that, though the reason for beginning a war, or continuing a war, may be removed, in the course of the war, there may be other reasons arise, in the course of the war for its continuance, or prolongation; and that the same set of terms, which would have been desirable at the former stage of the war, would be totally inadmissible at the latter? Your enemy seizes your county of Lancaster; you go to war in order to recover it; you succeed, but he gets possession of Somersetshire; and, are you to cease the war, because the original reason of it is removed? This part of your argument, is, therefore, worth nothing; and, as to the proposition, that "we have no just ground of offence against France for her conduct in the negotiation of 1806, *because* Russia has now openly avowed her hostility against us," it is too miserable a mockery of reasoning to merit serious remark. Not only may it happen, that a new reason for continuing a war may arise, during a war; but it may happen, that the new reason may arise out of the removal of the original reason; and this has been the case in the present instance; for, if we were now to negotiate, the basis and the terms ought to be very different indeed from what they might have been at the period of the negotiation of 1806. And, yet you tell us, that the war is now continued "without an object and without a cause," merely because we have lost the ally, for whose sake we, more immediately, broke off the negotiation conducted by Mr. Fox.

The terms, as above stated, would, in my opinion, have given to this country, in the state in which it was in 1806, not a moment of real repose. Hanover is set in the foreground, though it would be very difficult to shew how the restoration of that electorate could have been an honour to the "crown" of England. That France would offer to restore it was foreseen and foretold, long ago; and, the mighty sacrifice she therein would have made must be evident, when we recollect, first, that she has strip-

ped it could, a her pleas late mini Hanover dent to tering ce of keepi little surp wish to p have hel the rest nation re But, the divided You mu tion of with th your an to make to that us, how possession (or rather the island in actual in the w of them ceive the perpetua the color have ten to the se they we importan Europe, You pa what F we had posed. was to h an annu maintain state, th the isla Napoleo him du state, th France, want of In short offered enabled all ideas to disba time th our defe ciation former sent to rapidly

ped it of its very skin, and next, that she could, at any time, have re-occupied it at her pleasure. It was one of the sins of the late ministry to demand the restoration of Hanover, their motive for which was evident to all the world, namely, that of flattering certain prejudices as the sure means of keeping their places; and, it is not a little surprizing, that you, Sir, you who clearly wish to pay your court to the people, should have held forth, as a great concession to us, the restoration of that, which the whole nation regards as a mill-stone about its neck. But, the truth appears to be, that you were divided in your hopes and fears here again. You must have perceived, that the restoration of Hanover was not a favourite object with the nation; but, on the other hand, your anxiety to justify France induced you to make the most of the offer with respect to that miserable electorate. She offered us, however, the Cape of Good Hope (a possession of Holland), Malta, her colonies (or rather factories) in the East-Indies, and the island of Tobago, of all which we were in actual possession, while there existed not, in the world, the means of taking any one of them from us; and, if you do not perceive the fact, Mr. Talleyrand did, that the perpetual possession of all these, and of all the colonies of both hemispheres, would not have tended, even in the slightest degree, to the security of England, in which respect they were, all taken together, of far less importance than that little dot in the map of Europe, called the island of St. Marcou. You pass over, with great cautiousness, what France would have retained, in case we had made peace upon the terms proposed. You tell us that the King of Naples was to have had "the Balearic islands and an annuity from *Spain*, to enable him to maintain his *dignity*;" but you omit to state, that he was to have been deprived of the island of Sicily, by the peace, which Napoleon had not been able to take from him during the war; and, you also omit to state, that Sicily and Italy in possession of France, Malta must be given up by us for want of the means of feeding its inhabitants. In short, there appears to me to have been offered by France nothing that would have enabled us to dismantle, without abandoning all ideas of safety, a single ship of war, or to disband a single regiment that was, at the time the negociation began, necessary for our defence; and, the whole of the negociation only tended to confirm men in their former opinion, that Napoleon would consent to no peace, that should not work more rapidly than war towards his grand object,

the conquest and complete subjugation of England. You, however, think very differently. You think him perfectly sincere in all his pacific professions; and, as the reason you give in support of this opinion may be comprehended by others, though it is not by me, I shall here state it in your own words. "Whether the ruler of France was "or was not sincere in his professions for "peace, I shall not undertake to judge. "There is, however, *one circumstance* "which strongly favours the idea that he "was so, and which may, therefore, be "allowed to stand against the vague assertions, so generally made to the contrary." [Now, reader, watch narrowly for this circumstance.] "As Hanover was to be immediately and unconditionally restored to "its elector, an application appears to have "been made, during the negociation, by "Buonaparte to the king of Prussia, to "whom the possession of it had been ceded "by France as a conquered province, to "deliver it up to its former sovereign." [Have you found out the circumstance yet, reader?] "This application excited no "small share of indignation on the part of "the king of Prussia, who is said to have "expressed his determination, not to allow "himself to be divested of his dominions at "the will of the French ruler." [Have you got it yet?] "The consequence of this was "a most singular complication of affairs, "We were already at war with Prussia, "who had also refused to divest herself of "Hanover, although she had not the slightest pretensions to the sovereignty; and "though the establishment of peace between England and France might have "depended upon it." Have you found the "circumstance" yet, reader? If you have, you will do me a favour to lend me a little of your sharp-sightedness; for, after having read the paragraph over twenty times, with the utmost anxiety to find the statement of a circumstance "strongly favouring the idea "that Buonaparte was sincere in his professions for peace;" and that was to be "allowed to stand against the assertions, "so generally made to the contrary;" after all this anxious perusal, I can find, not only no such circumstance stated, but nothing at all that has any connection with the subject. Perhaps, however, Mr. Roscoe, you may mean, that the application made to the king of Prussia, for the surrender of Hanover, was a proof that Napoleon confidently expected, that he should soon have to restore it to the elector, and, of course, as confidently expected that a treaty of peace would grow out of the negociation then going on.

Aye; but this, Sir, is quite another thing. He might confidently expect, and sincerely wish for, a thing called a treaty of peace with England; and yet, at the same time, entertain towards her, views the most decidedly hostile. It was some circumstance such as would have favoured the idea of his being really peaceably inclined towards us, that I was expecting to hear you state; such, for instance, as an offer to set Holland and Spain free. This would have been something; this would not only have stood against "vague assertions," but against that chain of reasoning and of facts which have been advanced as the foundation of the opinion that he was not sincere in his propositions for peace; but, the offer of Hanover to us, so far from standing against such reasoning and facts, tend only to confirm us in the conclusions drawn from them.

Upon this part of the subject more will be said in my next letter, when I come to examine into the nature of your statements and opinions with respect to the relative situation of the two countries, supposing peace to be now made, leaving all the ports and naval arsenals upon the continent of Europe in the hands, or under the controul, of our enemy. The present I shall conclude with a remark or two upon the notions which you seem to entertain respecting the rights of sovereignty. You tell us, in the passage above quoted, that "Hanover had been ceded by France to the king of Prussia, *as a conquered province.*" Presently after you have to speak of the king of Prussia's refusal to deliver it up again, upon the application of France; whereupon you observe, "that Prussia *had not the slightest pretensions to the sovereignty;*" though the country (a conquered country) had been ceded to her by France. You acknowledge the right of conquest in France; you acknowledge her right to cede the electorate to Prussia; and yet you assert, that Prussia had not the slightest pretensions to the sovereignty of it, when France chose to command her to give it up; and, moreover, you justify France in demanding it without any equivalent, acknowledging that France has still a right to consider it as her own, and so to estimate it in the terms of a treaty, which she is making with us. Any thing so decidedly, so undisguisedly, French as this, I never before met with in any English writer; and nothing so impudently profligate in any of the reports of the Bishop of Autun. In vain would you save appearances by the paltry misrepresentation which follows: "Yet Prussia was now to be our ally; and this country had to defend her in a war occa-

sioned by her unjust refusal to restore to their lawful sovereign the patrimonial and long-descended dominions of the House of Brunswick." No, Sir, it was not a refusal to restore them to the elector, it was a refusal to give them up to France, and that, too, without any equivalent, that France might have them as an article of cession to us in the treaty that was, as was then expected, about to be made. You, all along, speak of Hanover as something, and, indeed, as a great thing, which France had to restore to us; before she could restore it she must possess it in right of conquest; that right she had ceded to Prussia; the right of Prussia must have been just as good as the right of France; and yet you contend, you flatly assert, that to the sovereignty of Hanover Prussia had not the slightest pretensions. There may possibly be some few persons, in England, who have, through all the transformations of the French government, from a simple democracy up to a simple military despotism, retained their original partiality for the rulers of that country; and these persons may applaud your present efforts; but, if I am not the most deceived of men, those efforts will, by every other description of persons, be considered as proceeding from a want of principle as flagrant as any that has been witnessed for a long series of years.

I am, yours, &c.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 16 Feb., 1808.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AMERICAN STATES.—The good citizens of this virtuous young empire are, it would seem, resolved not to leave the smallest doubt in the mind of any man living, that all which I have said *bad* of them is short of the truth. They will, before they have done, put their friends here to the blush, I am afraid, and will go very far towards confirming the truth of the late assertions of the Bishop of Autun, namely, that republican government is "fit for nothing but to make men rascals." This is the substance of what the Bishop said; and yet, it is very strange, that some of those who were attached to the Bishop while he held republican government to be absolutely necessary to preserve men from becoming brutes, should be attached to him now as much as they were before.—The first thing which I have to notice, relating to the American States, is a quarrel between Mr. John Randolph one of the members of the House of Representatives of the United States, and General Wilkinson, who has

long been the Western. It appears, expected Wil Spain, with had many and that, a the hands substantiated the followi rondelet, S to a Mr. Po January, 1 ria, Bern "been se "thousan "which s "of it, yo "ver it at "presente "ral, Don ter, duly a in his plac and made a some time was adjourn Washington The matter portance, b of a people a great dea mind, that the "most they have c commence Congress.

"This "bills, st "of street "as near

"In jus "to the w "Congres "ting sco

Correspond

"Sir,— "sions ha "personal "putation "imputed "stantially "statement "opinion "ascribed "commit "of my s

269]

long been entrusted with commands upon the Western frontier of the United States. It appears, that Mr. Randolph had long suspected Wilkinson of being in the pay of Spain, with whom the American States have had many squabbles about boundaries, &c.; and that, at last, some documents came into the hands of Mr. Randolph, whereon to substantiate the charge. Amongst others, the following letter, from the Baron de Carondelet, Spanish Intendant at New Orleans, to a Mr. Portell, at New Madrid, dated 20th January, 1806. "In the galley the Victoria, Bernardo Molina, Patron, there have been sent to Don Vincent Folch nine thousand six hundred and forty dollars, which sum, without making the least use of it, you will hold at my disposal to deliver it at the moment that an order may be presented to you by the American General, Don James Wilkinson."—This letter, duly attested, Mr. Randolph produced, in his place, on the 31st of December last, and made a motion upon the subject. After some time spent in debate, the discussion was adjourned. I must now copy from the Washington newspaper of the same date. The matter is curious, and of political importance, because it affords us a true picture of a people, with whom we have, at present, a great deal to do. The reader will bear in mind, that we are here going to speak of the "most virtuous people upon earth," as they have called themselves, even since the commencement of this present session of Congress.

"This morning the town was alarmed by bills, stuck up at every tavern, corners of streets, &c. The following is a copy, as near as I can recollect:—

"HECTOR UNMASKED!

"In justice to my character, I denounce to the world, John Randolph, Member of Congress, a prevaricating, base, calumniating scoundrel, poltroon and coward.

"JAS. WILKINSON."

Correspondence between Randolph and Wilkinson.

"Washington, Dec. 2, 1807.

"Sir,—I understand several expressions have escaped you, in their nature personal, and highly injurious to my reputation. The exceptionable language imputed to you, may be briefly and substantially compassed in the following statement. That you have avowed your opinion I was a rogue—that you have ascribed to me the infernal disposition to commit murder, to prevent the exposition of my sinister designs, and through me

"have stigmatised those citizen soldiers, who compose the meritorious military corps of our country. No person can be more sensible of the pernicious tendency of such cruel and undeserved reflections, in their application to public men or private individuals, than yourself; nor is any man more competent to determine the just reparation to which they establish a fair claim. Under these impressions, I can have no hesitation to appeal to your justice, your magnanimity, and your gallantry, to prescribe the manner and the measures of redress, being persuaded your decision will comport with the feelings of a man of honour, and that you will be found equally prompt to assert a right or repair a wrong. I transmit this letter through the post office, and shall expect your answer, by such channel as you may deem most proper. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

"JAS. WILKINSON."

"The Hon. John Randolph."

"SIR,—Several months ago I was informed of your having said, that you were acquainted with what had passed in the grand jury-room at Richmond, last spring, and that you had declared a determination to challenge me. I am to consider your letter of last night, by mail, as the execution of this avowed purpose, and, through the same channel, return you my answer. Whatever may have been the expressions used by me, in relation to your character, they were the result of deliberate opinion, founded upon the most authentic evidence, the greater part of which my country imposed upon me the painful duty to weigh and to decide upon; they were such, as to my knowledge and to yours, have been delivered by hundreds of the first men in the Union, and probably by a full moiety of the American people. In you, Sir, I can recognize no right to hold me accountable for my public or private opinion of your character, that would not subject me to an equal claim from Colonel Burr, or Serjeant Dunbaugh. I cannot descend to your level. This is my final answer.

"JOHN RANDOLPH."

"Brigadier General Wilkinson."

"Washington, Dec. 23.

"SIR,—I have received your letter of the 25th instant, by mail, in which you violate truth and honour, to indulge the inherent malignity and rancour of your soul. On what 'level,' pray Sir, shall we find the wretch, who, to masque his

“ cowardice, fabricates falsehoods, and head-
 “ unprovoked insults upon unmerited injus-
 “ ries? You, John Randolph, are this man,
 “ and your own breast can best solve the
 “ proposition. You ‘ cannot descend to
 “ my level;’ vain equivocal thing! And do
 “ you believe this dastardly subterfuge will
 “ avail you, or that your lion’s skin will
 “ longer conceal your true character? Em-
 “ brace the alternative still within your
 “ reach, and ascend to the ‘ level’ of a gen-
 “ tleman, if possible; act like a man, if you
 “ can, and spare me the pain of publishing
 “ you to the world, for an insolent, slander-
 “ ous, prevaricating poltroon.

“ JAMES WILKINSON.”

“ N. B. The first idea suggested by the
 “ indecency of your response to my letter,
 “ was the chastisement of my cane, from
 “ which the sacred respect I owe to the sta-
 “ tion you occupy in the councils of the
 “ nation, has alone protected you; and to
 “ the consequent conflict of feeling and du-
 “ ty must be ascribed the delay of this note.

“ JAMES WILKINSON.”

“ John Randolph, Esq.”

There is every chance, I think, of Wilkin-
 son’s being bribed by Spain; for, as to
 “ commercial concerns,” what commercial
 concerns could he possibly have? But, this
 is nothing new. It was proved as clear as
 day-light, that the secretary of state, in the
 time of Washington, asked the French mi-
 nister, Fauchet, for a bribe; and, to say the
 truth, the fact excited no public indignation,
 and very little surprize. In what a state,
 then, must that people be? I know what a
 state they are in; I know how unprincipled
 they are; I know what profligates they are,
 women as well as men; but, I wish to rest
 upon facts such as these now laid before the
 world, and which facts none of their in-
 terested advocates can deny. An extract
 from a Boston paper of the 31st of Decem-
 ber will enable the reader to judge of the
 correctness of my opinions, with regard to
 the effects of an embargo in America. “ All
 “ the letters from Washington announce a
 “ war with Great Britain as nearly inevita-
 “ ble. The embargo was carried by the
 “ influence of a spirit hostile to Great Bri-
 “ tain, and of course not very independent
 “ of France. *If the people of New England*
 “ *quietly submit to the system of attaching*
 “ *our fate to that of France, our indepen-*
 “ *dence is at an end.*—The embargo ap-
 “ pears, by the language of the government
 “ papers, intended to produce a coercive
 “ effect upon England. What would we
 “ compel her to do? To make reparation

“ for the attack on the Chesapeake? She
 “ has sent Mr. Rose, expressly commission-
 “ ed to do all that her character can suffer
 “ to be done without degradation, to satisfy
 “ the wounded feelings of our country. He
 “ is now near our coast if not arrived, bear-
 “ ing the olive branch, and tendering us sa-
 “ tisfaction, peace and good will. It is
 “ therefore madness to say, the embargo
 “ has any relation to the attack on the
 “ Chesapeake. What then are we to com-
 “ pel Great Britain to do by this embargo?
 “ She shall abandon her claim to her own
 “ subjects whenever they can get on board
 “ our merchant vessels! This is the only
 “ point that now labours between the two
 “ governments. To effect this concession
 “ on the part of England, we are called
 “ upon to sacrifice the prosperity of the
 “ country—to submit to the most distress-
 “ ing privations—many to absolute ruin,
 “ and all this with dignity and patience.—
 “ Let those who already see consternation
 “ stalking through our streets, and hundreds
 “ of poor but industrious men, even on the
 “ second day of the embargo, standing
 “ without any employment, suing for some
 “ means of earning a day’s support for their
 “ family, let them imagine this state of
 “ things, protracted a few months, and
 “ judge of the consequences. Will they be
 “ supportable? It is evident from the tone
 “ of the National Intelligencer, and cor-
 “ roborated by all the letters we have seen
 “ from Washington, that the embargo is to
 “ last, until its effects are felt across the
 “ Atlantic.—If so, it must continue many
 “ months. Can it be borne with dignity
 “ and patience?—We have given, in all,
 “ towards twenty millions of dollars, to
 “ prevent the French from owning territo-
 “ ries in our neighbourhood. It is now
 “ confidently asserted that Buonaparté has
 “ made arrangements, in his way, with the
 “ government of Spain, to cede him the
 “ Floridas! Thus, after wasting our trea-
 “ sury, and incurring an enormous debt, to
 “ secure the management of our own af-
 “ fairs without interruption, we are to have
 “ a French colony bordering with us upon
 “ the Atlantic. It is as evident as any thing
 “ can be, that with such a territory run-
 “ ning so far beyond them as our Louisiana
 “ possessions, we are more exposed, and
 “ less able to defend ourselves than ever.
 “ Thus ends the miserable policy of at-
 “ tempting to attain security by purchasing
 “ the ground that a suspected and meddle-
 “ some tenant might occupy.”—Now,
 this seems to me to be a pretty good answer
 to A. B. of the Morning Chronicle, to Mr.

Roscoe, v
 Alexande
 long and
 of the cor
 of an exar
 America
 thor of
 tions; an
 him, that
 candour,
 may choo
 for, it is
 should se
 proper m
 We see r
 embargo
 that des
 ceive ho
 fect Mr.
 England
 impartial
 stated by
 Council
 of Engla
 sure they
 and Por
 most ser
 in every
 poleon’s
 find out
 sugar an
 ject for
 without
 One is j
 try thes
 try the
 very mu
 time, N
 a real p
 that of
 rope.
 new tur
 idea of
 miliar t
 valuable
 Barings
 ly conc
 Mr. Ba
 infancy
 pected
 which
 may w
 interest
 honest
 a false
 with th
 gains a
 natural
 jurious
 satisfie
 well c

[273]

Roscoe, upon the same subject; and to Mr. Alexander Baring, M. P. who has written a long and most soporific pamphlet in defence of the conduct of America, under the guise of an examination into our conduct towards America. I recollect something of the author of this pamphlet, and of his connections; and, I would beg leave to suggest to him, that M. P. after his name, should, in candour, be followed by any titles which he may choose to attach to those connections; for, it is by no means fair that the reader should see but one side of him. This is a proper man, indeed, to answer Mr. Spence! We see no "melancholy effects" following embargo here. We do not see a picture like that described above. It is easy to conceive how the Orders in Council will affect Mr. Baring, but Mr. Baring is not English; nor can he be considered as an impartial judge in the case. It has been stated by the ministers, that the Orders of Council have *not* diminished the commerce of England. I wish they may; but, I am sure they will make misery enough in Spain and Portugal, and that they will produce most serious inconvenience in France, and in every country under her controul. Napoleon's ministers call upon the *chemists* to find out something to answer the purpose of sugar and coffee; and I have heard of a project for making grass into beef in France, without the help of the stomach of an ox. One is just as probable as the other. Let us try these Orders for a year or two. Let us try the sovereignty of the sea; and, I am very much deceived, if, at the end of that time, Napoleon will not be disposed to make a *real* peace with us. The contest now, is that of England against all the rest of Europe. A few years of this will give quite a new turn to men's minds; it will make the idea of being a match for all the world familiar to us, which will be infinitely more valuable than all the commerce of all the Barings and of every body else. I can easily conceive an apology for such a person as Mr. Baring. Men brought up, from their infancy, to count their gains, must be expected to feel most sensibly any measure by which their gains are diminished. They may write and advise what is hostile to the interests of their country, and yet be very honest men; because they see things through a false medium. Their gains they identify with their country's good; and, when their gains are diminished by any measure, they naturally conclude that such measure is injurious to the country. For my part, I am satisfied, that the Orders of Council are well calculated to promote the permanent

interests of England, and being so satisfied, I embarrass myself but very little as to the effects which they may have upon individuals, especially such as are so closely connected with other countries as to render them less than half Englishmen.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.—The subjects of the greatest interest, which have been brought before parliament, since the publication of my last remarks thereon, are, first, the *Danish Expedition*; second, the intended motion upon *India Affairs*; third, the *Curates' Suspension Bill*; fourth, the *Droits of Admiralty*.—A motion similar to that made in the Commons, was made in the House of Lords, relative to the Danish Expedition; that is to say, a motion for the production of the papers, or information, upon which the expedition was undertaken, it being alledged by the "gentlemen opposite," that positive proof of the hostile disposition of Denmark, or, at least, of the intention, and the power, of France, to seize the Danish fleet, was necessary to justify our conduct towards the former power. In this debate, the "gentlemen opposite" certainly had the best end of the argument; because the ministers, very unwisely, had, at several stages of the proceeding, talked of such information as the grounds of their measure; whereas, if they had rested their justification solely upon the notorious circumstances of the case, they would have been plagued with none of these discussions; the common sense of the country being with them, they might have left their opponents to indulge in their unavailing accusations. But, not only did their timidity; their want of courage to defend the measure upon the only solid ground, lead them to pretend to have received positive information; they did not stop here, and say, that we cannot reveal this information, without great injury to the public service, but, in the debate in the House of Commons, Mr. Canning did produce papers; that is to say, he read parts of letters from Mr. Garlike, our late minister at Copenhagen, and also of letters from Lord Hutchinson; and, having done this, it appeared impossible to give any good reason why the whole of the correspondences should not be produced. Motions were, therefore, made for this purpose; and though they were negatived, as all motions against the minister are, I think, however odd it may seem; though these motions were negatived, the public could see no reason whatever for the refusal, it appearing manifestly unjust, that you should tell me

that the exposition of the correspondence would be injurious to the nation, at the very moment that you yourself read from it those parts which suit your purpose. Here we have an instance of the mischievous effects of that eternal desire to triumph in debate. There was not the least necessity for the reading of the papers in question. The speech of Mr. Canning, without any other facts to state than such as were notorious, and needed only to be brought together, and placed in a strong light before the public, was quite sufficient. Not sufficient to satisfy every man, perhaps; but, certainly ninety-nine men out of every hundred. But, this was not enough. There must be a debating triumph, and this triumph, like most triumphs gained by unfair means, has been but very short-lived.—It was curious, however, to hear the language of the Outs, upon this occasion. They were quite indignant that Mr. Garlike's correspondence had been misrepresented, which misrepresentation might injure his fair fame in foreign countries. They did not make the motions, or the speeches, you would have thought, for any purpose connected with a desire to harass their rivals in the race of profit and power; no, but from a deep sense of the injustice, which had been done to this gentleman, who, they were under great apprehensions, might, by the courts abroad, be suspected of having said one thing to them and another thing to his own government; rather than leave him in which predicament, they would almost suffer martyrdom, as far, at least, as martyrdom could be inflicted by the hearing of long speeches. Generous souls! I dare say, that Mr. Garlike, who, though he is said to be a most accomplished diplomatic minister, may know little about St. Stephen's, was overpowered with such an amazing display of generosity; but, if he be wise, he will leave it to be, like other righteous deeds, its own reward.—Lord Hutchinson stood in need of no defender. He spoke for himself; and, he not only cleared up the misrepresentation, which, as he stated, had been made with respect to his letters, but told a long story, gave a detailed narrative, of his conversations with the Emperor Alexander, proving, however, as far as it proved any thing, that the war with Russia was *not produced* by the Danish expedition, though he thought it was *hastened* by that measure. But, of what use was it to give us the words, or the opinions of that Autocrat? What are his sayings and opinions to us? Is he the only judge, or any judge at all, of what is necessary to the

safety of England? But, now that he is the avowed enemy of this country, he is with some people, become a very wise man, and, I suppose, they will soon begin to think, that his government is an admirable one. Nay, complaints are made against the press for abusing him. It is very true, that the base hirelings, who had applauded him to the skies but a few days before, did, the moment he had made the peace of Tilsit, begin to assail him in a most unmerciful manner, not forgetting to hint, that a repetition of the effect of poor Paul's "two penny-worth of whipcord" might be of sovereign utility. This was very base, certainly; but, from us, who always thought justly of him; who always held him and his armies in a proper degree of estimation; who always abhorred the idea of relying upon him and his slaves for the preservation of the independence of England; from us, all that can be expected is, that we should now abstain from downright abuse of him, being perfectly at liberty to laugh at him as much as we please. It would appear, that there is something contagious in the touch of princes. Most men, who have been admitted to converse with them, become their eulogists; and yet, as far as I have been able to verify facts; as far as the public conduct of princes can warrant the forming of an opinion, I can discover no other general cause for this than that of vanity, the vanity, the empty vanity, of being considered as the friend of a prince; as if that alone were any thing honourable; as if it added to the importance of the person professing such friendship. Two countrymen being in a wood, where king William was hunting, said the one to the other, in a tone of exultation, "the king rode so close by me that he almost knocked me down."—"Aye," said the other, "but he spoke to me."—"Indeed! what did he say?"—"Why he said, with such a noble voice, *stand out of the way, you son of a b——*." The vanity here displayed was not at all more contemptible and ridiculous than that which we daily witness in persons who have not the same apology that might be made for these poor woodmen.—During these debates, relative to the Danish Expedition, Marquis Wellesley, according to the news-paper reports, made a long speech, in which he dwelt much upon the unprincipled ambition of Napoleon; upon the ravages of his conquests, and his total contempt of all the principles upon which nations have hitherto acted towards one another. This was all very true; but, I am afraid, that the noble Marquis will see, that, notwithstanding all the violences and crimes

of Napoleon while at le flattered an he be suffe dethroning but that all sanction, peace, in will see, a ceremony good look (ry her) "if she cha husband, admiration ish me, if to set up der, verif "greatest let us hope in the end of this un some how vengeance are now- fiance.— tary deba ry to noti motion of Affairs, to the forward poses to certain r of parlia Mr. Tier men opp ry; they a single matter a making. The mo this disc what n will tak have fo in offic which his ene into th now no what h much their they m are inc their of ke might them ving t

[277]

of Napoleon, he will not only escape (for a while at least) with impunity; but will be flattered and caressed; that, not only will he be suffered to enjoy the fruits of all his dethronings and plunderings and murders, but that all these will receive a sort of legal sanction, by and by when we come to make peace, in like manner, the noble Marquis will see, as a notorious strumpet is, by the ceremony of marriage (when she has the good look to find a man base enough to marry her) "made an honest woman," and, if she chance to have a rich or powerful husband, becomes an object of praise and admiration. Nay, it would not at all astonish me, if Napoleon, thus purified, were to set up for a satirist of tyranny and plunder, verifying the old saying, that "the greatest rogue cries rogue first." But, let us hope, with the noble Marquis, that, in the end, justice will take place; that, out of this unnatural state of things, will arise, some how or other, the means of inflicting vengeance upon the heads of all those, who are now able to set law and justice at defiance.—The second subject of parliamentary debate, which it appears to me necessary to notice, is a motion, or rather intended motion of Lord Folkestone, relative to *India Affairs*, and particularly, as it would seem, to the transactions in Oude, first brought forward by Mr. Paull. His lordship proposes to confine himself to the moving of certain resolutions, expressive of the opinion of parliament, as to those transactions; but, Mr. Tierney, and the rest of the "gentlemen opposite," are for a committee of inquiry; they are for a regular *set to*, and not for a single motion, which will get rid of the matter at once; they are for bout after bout, making, in the whole, a grand combat. The most interesting point, connected with this discussion, will be, however, to see in what manner the "gentlemen opposite" will take the matter up. The public cannot have forgotten the manner, in which, *while in office*, they treated Mr. Paull; the means which they made use of to thwart all his endeavours to institute a fair inquiry into these very transactions. They have now no other information to go upon, than what he wrung from them with almost as much difficulty as he would have got one of their places; and, if they proceed at all, they must proceed upon that, for which they are indebted to him, after having subscribed their hundreds of pounds, for the purpose of keeping him out of parliament, that he might no longer have the power to torment them with this very subject, and after having treated him with such intolerable arro-

gance and injustice, when, at a later period, he had the indiscretion to put himself within the reach of their fangs. For this, amongst other things, I was glad to see them overthrown; and, if ever there was perfect justice done to men, upon this earth, it is that which they have experienced at the hands of the Wellesleys, who, the moment the king's determination was known, voted against them, to a man, and are now amongst the most formidable of their opponents. It will, indeed, be curious to see how the "gentlemen opposite" will now take this matter up. The eyes of the public will be, as they well know, fixed steadily upon them; and, for myself, I give them my word, that I will not fail to do my best, in order to enable my readers to judge of their conduct now, compared with their conduct, as connected with the same subject, in 1806.—The *Curates' Suspension Bill* has made no great figure in the report of the debates; but it relates to a matter very particularly worthy of public attention. The history of it is this: In 1796, an act was passed, having for its object the bettering of the situation of curates of the established church; but, into the same act, after it got to the Lords, was interwoven a clause, making a former benefice voidable, in case the incumbent accepted of a perpetual curacy, augmented by Queen Anne's bounty. Before this act was passed, a perpetual curacy might be legally held with any other benefice or benefices. Nothing could be more reasonable than this provision; because the intention of the augmentation of the revenue of the perpetual curacies, was, to make it sufficient for the maintenance of a clergyman. Nevertheless, the act being generally considered as containing nothing but provisions relating to *stipendiary* curates, there did, with respect to the clause just spoken of, a general ignorance prevail. Under the influence of this ignorance, the Rev. James Scott was, in 1805, nominated to the perpetual curacy of Titley, in Herefordshire, having, in 1801, been presented to the rectory of Brampton Bryan, in the same county, by his brother-in-law, Lord Oxford, with whose consent and approbation he accepted of the perpetual curacy. In 1806 (Mr. Scott being out of England, as chaplain of a king's ship), Lord Oxford, finding that, in consequence of the act of 1796, his brother-in-law had, by accepting the curacy, to which acceptance he had given his consent, forfeited the living of Brampton Bryan (the latter being worth seven times, perhaps, as much as the former), took advantage thereof, and presented another person

to the living. To prevent the effect of this, a bill was brought in, and passed, during the last session of parliament, suspending the effect of the above-mentioned clause in the act of 1796; and, the bill, just now passed, repeals that suspension; so that Mr. Scott loses his living.—With respect to the suspension bill, it was not at all more unjust than the suspension bill passed in 1800, or 1801, relative to non-residence, which professedly had an effect upon past actions, and was to all intents and purposes, *a law after the fact*; or, what the “learned” call, an *ex post facto* law. But, I am not pleading its defence; and, I should have voted for its repeal, especially as it appears that Mr. Scott, having two benefices with cure of souls, left them both, while he went even out of the kingdom, no matter in what capacity, but, in fact, in a capacity which gave him a third clerical income, in doing which, though he has but too many, whose example he can plead, it is, I think, impossible for any one to justify him. Yet, what shall be said of Lord Oxford? He first gives him the living; he next gives his consent and approbation to the acceptance of the curacy; and, then, he avails himself of a clause in an act of parliament, of which Mr. Scott, at least, was ignorant, to take from him the living, worth seven times, nay, I believe, ten times, as much as the curacy. I think, I may safely defy any one to cite me any thing to match this transaction. The subject admits not of amplification. There can be no comment upon it which would not weaken the impression produced by the bare facts. The only point, upon which a doubt can possibly arise, is, whether Lord Oxford did actually give his consent and approbation to the acceptance of the curacy by Mr. Scott; and, if we were to place no reliance upon the assertion of Mr. Scott, undenied by Lord Oxford, still the undeniable fact, that Lord Oxford himself, upon Mr. Scott's acceptance of the curacy, became his tenant of the tythes belonging to the curacy, would completely remove all doubt; for, as Mr. Scott states, in his petition, it is “the strongest proof of the knowledge, assent, and privity” of Lord Oxford, to the nomination and appointment of Mr. Scott to the curacy.—Such was the opinion which Mr. Scott's curate at Brampton Bryan entertained of the transaction, that he, though, probably, a very poor man, refused, it seems, to accept of the living; and, it was not until some time had been spent in the search, that an acceptor was found, in the person of a Rev. Mr. Graham, whose readiness to shew his obedience

to the law was the subject of high eulogium with the Archbishop.—The *Droits of Admiralty* would, if we had room, form a most copious subject, which, for the present, I shall content myself with merely opening.—At a time, when we are called upon to sacrifice our “last shilling and our last drop of blood,” it becomes our duty to enquire into how millions are expended. The Royal family, in all its branches, have an abundance allowed from the taxes, without any occasional grants at all. The aggregate of the sum is immense, and makes no trifling figure when compared with the sum necessary to maintain twelve hundred thousand poor.—We are told, that these *Droits of Admiralty* are very ancient; and so were many things now no longer in existence. For every innovation that is to diminish our liberties or to encroach upon our property, an apology is founded upon the altered circumstances of the times and the world. Well, then, why are we not to make the same plea for a change with respect to these *droits of admiralty*? If we look back, I'll warrant we shall find, that, during all the preceding reigns, from the Norman conquest downwards, the *droits of admiralty* have not amounted to a sum so large as that of the present reign alone.—But, there are so many important considerations that present themselves as appertaining to this subject, that I will not attempt to enter upon them here.—Below I insert the debate, as I find it in the *Morning Chronicle*, being anxious to give to every thing connected with this matter as extensive and as speedy a circulation as possible.—The reader will not fail to notice what Mr. Sheridan says about the *Prince of Wales*. There will be few of the grants that will not find an advocate in one, or in another; and, if the enquiry was in any other hands than those of Sir Francis Burdett, I should expect to see it die away in smoke.

DROITS OF ADMIRALTY.

Debate, in the House of Commons, 11th Feb. 1808, as given in the Morning Chronicle.

SIR F. BURDETT rose, in pursuance of notice, to make his motion relative to the captured property at the disposal of the crown. He thought it unnecessary, in the first instance, to enter upon any detail. It appeared to him, that these accounts being intended as a ground of parliamentary proceeding, must be granted of course. He would, therefore, for the present, simply move, that there be laid before the house an account of all captures by his Majesty's Naval Forces, since the year 1792, claimed to be, or

remaining at the amount of and the application of the CHANCELLOR that it was a so, to make captures. captures had coronæ, but miral. A captors, and property of portion of t be the polic ed it. Un given to the money, tha parliament a fund, th in the app had grown been made Grants had different t the royal being illeg would be application to know v 1792, and But as he application to insist tion. It fore, to c at present ther info the paper ing farther DETT had chalked for the g time wa house. any facts hended t large a s crown, it shoul the lega rable do POLE ex of the subject ought Advoc miralty subject procee that it made

[261]

remaining at the disposal of the crown; stating the amount of each capture, the net proceeds, and the application up to this day.—THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that it was almost impossible, if not entirely so, to make up an account of such individual captures. Much of the proceeds of these captures had accrued to the king, not *jure coronæ*, but in his capacity of lord high Admiral. A great part had been given to the captors, and the whole was as much the property of his majesty as the appropriated portion of the Civil List. Whatever might be the policy of this, the house had sanctioned it. Unquestionably, if bad advice was given to the crown in the disposal of this money, that would be a good ground for parliamentary inquiry: but, considered as a fund, the house could not intermeddle in the application of it. When this sum had grown to a large amount, grants had been made out of it for the public service. Grants had certainly been made out of it at different times to the younger branches of the royal family: but this was so far from being illegal, that he doubted whether it would be considered by any as an improper application. The hon. baronet had a right to know what had been the proceeds since 1792, and what was the amount at present. But as he had alleged no instance of misapplication, he ought not, at this moment, to insist upon an account of the application. It would be sufficient for him, therefore, to confine himself to the other points at present, and afterwards move for any further information, when he had examined the papers, and stated any grounds for desiring farther information.—SIR FRANCIS BURDETT had no objection to follow the line chalked out to him by the right hon. gent. for the great object he had in view at this time was to have the amount before the house. He had not, indeed, as yet stated any facts of misapplication; yet he apprehended the house would not endure that so large a sum should be at the disposal of the crown, without any inquiry, even although it should be admitted that the crown had the legal right, of which, however, considerable doubts were entertained.—SIR CHARLES POLE expressed his approbation of the motion of the hon. baronet, for all his reflections on the subject convinced him that the admiralty court ought to be upon a new footing.—THE ADVOCATE GENERAL observed, that the admiralty court had nothing to do with the subject of this motion. Before the house proceeded any further in it, it was proper that it should know what grounds could be made out for an inquiry. The captured pro-

perty came to the king in a double capacity. That which was seized before the declaration of war, and the issuing of letters of marque and reprisals, belonging to him *jure coronæ*. That which was captured afterwards was his as lord high admiral, whose rights accrued to the crown when the office was put into commission. But it was the custom to give up what part belonged to him in this capacity, or, after the issuing of reprisals, to the captors. Another species of property was that which was captured in port, or by such as were not licensed captors. This was properly the droits of the admiralty, and belonging to the king in virtue of the office of high admiral. In 1795, when the French made an irruption in Holland, encouragement was held out to the inhabitants to remove to a neutral country, and if they did this, the property detained here on that occasion was to be restored to them. But as they had not done this, it was condemned to the crown as taken before reprisals. The Spanish property seized before reprisals in 1796, was also condemned as the droits of the admiralty. On the breaking out of the war in May, 1803, hostilities were not commenced against Holland till the 16th of June following; Dutch property, however, was detained in the mean time, and afterwards condemned as prize to the crown. Spanish, Prussian, and Danish property was condemned under similar circumstances, the captors having no claim; and in case of a convention to restore it at the end of the war, the crown would be bound to do so. But no convention of that sort existed, and consequently the property remained at the disposal of the crown. Then how was it applied? A moiety, or perhaps two-thirds was granted as a reward to the captors—a circumstance that must be pleasing to the hon. baronet (Pole) who was so anxious for the interests of the naval service. Another part had been applied to the relief of the public exigencies of the state, to the extent of two millions—one having been granted some time ago and another lately. Part had been applied to the relief of those who had suffered from the breaking out of the war. The Spanish government had sequestered property belonging to this country, which, by a stipulation in the treaty of Amiens, they had engaged to restore. This was not done, and some of the captured property belonging to the crown, was applied to the relief of the sufferers. Another part had been granted to captors who had not been allowed to act under the ordinary discretionary powers; and another to those who had suffered from the insolvency of

captors. These had been the different modes in which this property had been disposed of. But he did not by any means wish to keep out of view, that a very small part of it had, out of his Majesty's grace and liberality, been conferred on the younger branches of his family. Was he the only father in the kingdom who was not to be allowed to make grants out of funds, appertaining to him by law, to his own children? If any thought so, he was not ashamed to say that he differed from him. The house would dispose of the motion as it pleased, but no instance of misapplication had been stated—no grounds of inquiry had been laid. The house was competent, certainly, to go into such an inquiry, but in his opinion no reason had been assigned for the exercise of its right on the present occasion.—Mr. LUSHINGTON perfectly agreed with the last speaker, that this motion had no reference to the Admiralty Court. He also agreed with him in the greater part of what he said relative to the right of the crown to this property; but differed from him materially as to constant propriety of the application. One instance of misapplication he would state to the house. An hon. baronet (Sir H. Popham) whom he saw in his place, had, in the year 1787, obtained leave of absence on half pay from the naval service, in which he was then a lieutenant. He went to Ostend, and there procured a ship, the *El Etrusco*, bearing the Imperial flag, in which he freighted a cargo for the East Indies. He there exchanged his vessel for an American ship, and carried a cargo to Canton in China; having taken in a fresh cargo there, of which a French supercargo at Canton had a share, he sailed first for Ireland, and from that to Dungeness, where he landed goods, or, in plain English, smuggled them [Hear! hear! and laughter]. Lieut. Bowen of the *Brilliant* frigate, Capt. Robinson, seized the ship in Ostend Roads, after a person had escaped on shore with part of the goods. This vessel was brought to judgment in the Admiralty Court. During the proceedings, the hon. baronet claimed his share of the cargo and freight; but when it became necessary to serve a process of the Court upon him, he was not to be found, and, in short, had absconded. The ship was condemned; but for all the trouble, the inconvenience, and loss of time occasioned in the prosecution of the business, Captain Robinson did not receive one shilling. Yet afterwards, in consequence of a Treasury Warrant, signed by the Marquis of Blandford and Mr. Long, founded upon a report for that purpose, re-

luctantly signed by the right hon. gent. (the Advocate-General) £25,000, was restored to the hon. baronet [Hear! hear!] being the amount of his claim, and that too without deducting from it any of the expenses of the process. It was some time, indeed, before the right hon. gent. (the Advocate-General) could be induced to give a recommendation to this effect, and his scruples were highly to his credit. These circumstances formed part of the Records of the Admiralty Court, but he had only received the papers that morning. Here, then, was an application of a large sum as a reward for a violation of the laws of the country. He was glad, therefore, that a disposition appeared to examine this subject, but he thought the business would be very imperfectly done unless the house attended to the application of the money, which was, perhaps, the most material point of the whole.—SIR H. POPHAM observed, that having been thus personally attacked, he could not but offer a few observations in his own vindication. Although, if the hon. gent. who had thrown out such aspersions as had never been used in that house, had given him any previous intimation of his intention to bring forward circumstances in which he was particularly concerned, he would have been better prepared to meet his statement. He would, however, now advert to a plain and well known fact. The house would recollect he went to the East Indies at a period of profound peace, and had been there employed in the service of the East India Company. If the hon. gent. would consult the records of the India House, he would find that lord Cornwallis, the Governor General, and the Council, had recommended him strongly to the Court of Directors, and said that he had deserved that the Directors should apply to the Admiralty to promote him. He had besides received acknowledgments and presents for his services. He was not, surely, the only British Officer who had gone on board a neutral vessel in order to acquire knowledge and skill in his profession. It was singular that the hon. gent. should select him as an object to attack for what had been so generally done. Surely his exertions in India must have been very extraordinary [a laugh] to induce the Governor and Council to recommend him so strongly, and to produce this particular attack. Perhaps he was sorry that he had gone out under a foreign flag; many might, in a moment of disappointment, do things which they might afterwards disapprove. But he trusted that he would never violate the laws of his country, nor resort to smuggling without there being

something in the case which would do away the essence and effect of the offence. He hoped this matter would be fully inquired into, and thoroughly sifted, that the House might be enabled to judge upon a complete view of all the circumstances.—Mr. SHERIDAN fully agreed with the hon. captain, that after the attack which had been made upon him, the matter ought not to rest there. It was due both to the house and him, that the matter should be investigated. He also agreed, that his hon. friend behind him might have given some notice of his intention; but then it was to be observed that he had only read the papers that morning, and had stated the facts upon an occasion which had suddenly arisen. But if it was necessary to have this affair inquired into, upon the statement of his hon. friend, it was much more so after the defence of the hon. captain. He said, he had, like other officers, entered, in time of peace, on board a foreign vessel, to acquire additional skill in his profession. But how did other officers engage in these services? They were employed entirely in their own profession—but who ever heard of their taking advantage of a foreign flag to trade to the East Indies, and land teas at Dungeness?—The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER rose to order. It was not consistent with any rules of order or justice, that a conversation should be carried on so long that had only arisen collaterally; and that personal attacks should thus be made on an individual, without giving him any notice, or allowing him time to prepare his defence. To what purpose was this carried on? There was no motion on that particular question before the house; and it was impossible that such a statement, unauthorised as it was, could be a sufficient ground for calling, in the first instance, for an account of the application of the sums arising from captured property belonging to the crown. He hoped the right honourable gentleman himself would thank him for interrupting him; and he also hoped that an opportunity would be afforded of fully considering the case which had occasioned this deviation from the main object.—Mr. SHERIDAN rose again, but not, he said, to complain of the Chancellor of the Exchequer having interrupted him; on the contrary, he should now abstain from any further comment on the hon. captain's (Sir Home Popham) defence—at the same time, Mr. Sheridan shewed, that he had been perfectly in order, and now only deferred his argument from a principle of delicacy, understanding the Chancellor of the Exchequer to agree with the hon. captain, that a further

and full investigation was absolutely necessary. After what had passed, after the charge so distinctly and forcibly made, and urged by a member in his place, it was absolutely necessary to the character and honour of the hon. captain, but what was of more importance, it was essential to the character and honour of the House that such an investigation should take place.—Mr. Sheridan then said, he should add only a few words on that part of the question which related to the *application* of the money arising from these *Droits of Admiralty*. He had no hesitation in saying that he not only did not censure, but he cordially concurred in, and approved of that part of the application this day avowed by his Majesty's Judge Advocate, namely, his majesty's gracious gifts to the younger branches of his Illustrious Family. No member but must feel that their incomes never had, under the pressure of the times, been adequate to the expenditure imposed upon them by their rank and situation, and he had never heard any charge of wanton extravagance preferred against any one of the illustrious individuals alluded to. So far was he, therefore, from objecting to these acts of his majesty's paternal generosity, he only lamented that his majesty's royal munificence had been confined to the younger branches of his august family. Had the heir apparent participated in it, he believed the house and the country would have not merely been satisfied, but gratified; [hear! hear!] for never must it be forgot ten, that the Prince had an unliquidated claim, which, greatly to his honour, feeling for the public burthen, and the difficulty of the times, had been, by his royal highness's express desire, suspended, but not abandoned, (he meant the arrears of the Duchy of Cornwall): that debt still remained indisputably due, either from the sovereign or the public; and, towards the discharge of that debt, he could not conceive an application of the funds now under discussion, more grateful to the people, than in part directing them towards that object. His majesty's munificence towards the younger branches of his august family, was an act of bounty, in the latter case it would be an act, not of bounty merely, but of justice.—THE ADVOCATE GENERAL said, that this property was not property condemned to the crown, but came by a forfeiture, which on good grounds might justly be remitted. The ground on which he recommended the grant to the hon. captain, was this. He had gone to Ostend, and from that sailed under a foreign flag to India. If he was restrained as a British subject from doing so

by the law of his country, unquestionably this was a violation of it. But it was perfectly well known to the Indian government, that he was there, and it was the policy at that time to encourage exportation from India in foreign vessels. Whatever offence had been committed, was against the East India Company, and as they had by implication remitted it, he thought himself justified in recommending the remission of the forfeiture.—**MR. TIERNEY** called the right hon. gent. to order, as he was entering upon a defence of the hon. captain, instead of confining himself to the facts for his own justification.—Some discussion arose here about the question under discussion, whether it was the original motion or the amendment suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in some measure assented to?—**SIR FRANCIS BURDETT** however, now refused to withdraw his motion. The apparent fairness of the right hon. gent. opposite, had led him rather to assent to his amendment at first, because his object was to get an account of the large sum at the disposal of the crown, without the controul of Parliament, thinking this a sufficient ground for an enquiry. But since the gross and flagrant instance of misapplication, stated by the hon. gent. behind, had come to his knowledge, he considered the application as the most important part of the subject, and must persevere in his original intention. He should abandon his duty if he withdrew his motion, and he doubted, if the house would allow him were he so inclined.—The discussion thus of course proceeded on the original motion.—**THE ADVOCATE GENERAL** proceeded to state the grounds on which he had recommended the remission of the forfeiture. It amounted to this, that the company themselves had, by employing the hon. captain in making soundings, and by giving him presents, &c. recognized his right of going to India, as much as if they had given him a licence. The only question was, whether, under these circumstances, the forfeiture ought not to be restored, and it had been determined that it ought.—**MR. LUSHINGTON** disclaimed all idea of reflecting upon the right hon. gent., who, he was well informed, had acted in this business reluctantly. In his own justification, he stated, that he had heard the facts long ago, but doubting whether they had been accurately stated, he had from hearing the notice of yesterday, applied at the proper place this morning, and seen the documents. He thought himself in duty called upon to make the statement, in opposition to the assertions on the other side, that there had been no

misapplication of the Admiralty Droits.—**MR. BRAND** said, that the opposition to the account of application convinced him, that it ought not to be dropped. The misapplication had been proved in one instance, at least in a statement that had arisen out of the partial communications on the other side of the manner in which these sums were applied. They appeared to have a consciousness that all was not right on that score.—**MR. HUSKISSON** then moved the Amendment proposed by his right hon. friend, That an Account be produced of the Net Proceeds of the captures, &c. since 1793, together with the Balances in hand.—**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER** said, that the only difference between himself and the hon. baronet was as to the production of an account of the application. He contended that this was not necessary, till a misapplication was stated. One instance had been mentioned, —but it had not been proved; and came rather under the description of a forfeiture which had been remitted—a thing that was very common.—**MR. ADAM** said that it would be wiser to call only for the amount of the sum in the first instance; neither of the motions would include the case which had been adverted to. This ought to be investigated, but in order to get at it, a motion must be made for an account of the forfeitures remitted.—**SIR CHARLES POLE** observed, that neither of the motions were so full as he could wish. He stated that it often happened that ten years elapsed between the capture and the time the captors could get their prize money. In such cases prize money was of no use.—**SIR FRANCIS BURDETT** said, that his motion was sufficiently comprehensive to include all that was material at present.—The house then divided. For the original Motion 57. For the Amendment 82.

MR. ARTHUR YOUNG

ON

AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURES, AND COMMERCE.

SIR,—I have read with much attention the several papers which have appeared in your Journal, upon the subject of trade and manufacture, under the title of *Perish Commerce*; and, I have considered with equal attention the essay recommended by you, and written with great ingenuity by Mr. Spence; but, I must confess myself to be very far removed from that sort of conviction, which you seem to think should flow from his reasoning: the same doctrines were warmly debated about forty years ago in France, and in my opinion sufficiently re-

futed by
on the C
consider
thirty ye
of Physi
gaged th
whose v
equally
volved in
plexed w
cal in the
liberality
much err
points wh
were

I. Tha
national

II. Th
nothing

III. T
them be
may, all
on land.

These
and you,
blish, wi
papers w
tellect, a
waited in
of your
the doctri
rience, r
ing; but
is incline
duced to
beg leave
jections
in 1774.

There
the abov
without
for a mo
truths ar
traces th
not from
that are
conclusio
agreed t
state of
Spence,
these ma
some obs
widely, t
with tw
lowing h
“ Ha
convictio
wealth u
seed, &c

futed by various writers both in England and on the Continent. The controversy lasted a considerable time; but it has slept for above thirty years; the Economists gave the name of *Physiocratie* to their science, which engaged the pens of many extremely able men whose works abound with observations equally luminous and important, but involved in such a cloud of verbiage, and perplexed with such a jargon of terms, technical in their science, that the large measure of liberality and truth is to be separated from much error, and many mistakes: the leading points which those writers laboured to prove, were

I. That agriculture is the only source of national wealth.

II. That manufactures and commerce add nothing to national riches.

III. That as agriculture pays all taxes, let them be imposed in whatever manner they may, all should be laid, in the first instance, on land.

These are the doctrines which Mr. Spence and you, Sir, have undertaken to re-establish, with some variations, in a series of papers which manifest great powers of intellect, and vigour of expression. I have waited in earnest expectation of seeing some of your numerous correspondents examine the doctrine as a question of fact and experience, rather than one of theory and reasoning; but, as I do not perceive that any one is inclined thus to treat the subject, I am induced to send you some doubts upon it, and beg leave to refer you for more particular objections to my *Political Arithmetic* printed in 1774.

There is a measure of truth in the first of the above maxims, for a nation may exist without commerce or manufacture, but not for a moment without agriculture; but such truths are about as valuable as the ink that traces them; they are rendered interesting not from being true, but by the conclusions that are drawn from them; and the grand conclusion drawn by the Economists and agreed to, illustrated, and applied to the state of this country by yourself and Mr. Spence, forms the subject of the second of these maxims. Mr. Spence has however some observations, that apparently deviate so widely, that I must beg leave to trouble you with two or three quotations. In the following he allows nothing to commerce.

"Having thus stated the grounds of my conviction, that we derive *no national wealth whatever, from our commerce*, I proceed, &c. p. 64."

In another place he considers it as unnecessary.

"There can be no doubt then, if such be the painful nature of those opinions, which resolve our greatness into our commerce, that all those who hold such opinions, would be highly gratified to have their fallacy proved to them. They would doubtless be rejoiced to have it convincingly made out, that our greatness is independent of our commerce; and that our glory and our prosperity need not suffer diminution, even though we had infinitely less trade than we have, p. 9."

But, from the utmost attention I can give to the chain of Mr. Spence's reasoning, I cannot see the consistency of such opinions with other passages in his work, which apparently militate directly against them. Thus he says,

"The value obtained in foreign markets for the manufactures which a nation exports, resolves itself into the value of the food which has been expended in manufacturing them, and the profit of the master manufacturer, and the exporting merchant. These profits are undoubtedly national profit. Thus, when a lace manufacturer has been so long employed in the manufacturing a pound of flax into lace, that his subsistence during that period, has cost £30, this sum is the real worth of the lace; and if it be sold at home, whether for £30 or £60, the nation is, as has been shown, no richer for this manufacture. But if this lace be exported to another country, and there sold for £60, it is undeniable that the exporting nation has added £30 to its wealth by its sale, since the cost to it was only £30, p. 48."

And again more decisively,

"An attention to facts will prove in opposition to the opinion of the Economistes, that in Britain agriculture has thriven only in consequence of the influence of manufactures; and that the increase of this influence, is requisite to its further extension, p. 22."

That manufactures are nothing more than a transmutation of food into fabrics, was started and amplified by the Economistes; Mr. Spence thus adopts it.

"None of this wealth, however, could with truth be said to have been brought into existence by the manufacturer, for as the land proprietor had given in exchange for the produce of the manufacturers labour, an equal value in food, which no longer remained in existence, all the merit which could justly be conceded to the latter, would be his having transmuted wealth of so pe-

K

rishable a nature as food, into the more durable wealth of manufactures. p. 18."

Now, Sir, it seems to me only necessary to oppose some of these passages to each other, in order to shew, I will not say a direct contradiction, but at least ground sufficient for a suspicion that there must be some degree of uncertainty in the combinations whence such conclusions are drawn; and that the subject has not been examined with that attention which its importance demands. The error may perhaps be found in the transmutation idea; the food is admitted to be wealth, wealth flowing from agriculture, the fabrics are wealth, but still agricultural wealth; as it has been no more than a transmutation: but, I contend that it is a creation; and not by the farmer who cultivates, but by the manufacturer who demands. Without the demand the food would have never been produced; the cause of producing is in the consumer, much more than in the cultivator; who is a machine employed to make a commodity demanded, and becomes a machine that has lost its wheels if that demand ceases. A machine that would not, as to present importance, have had any existence had not such demand arisen. If I understand Mr. Spence in the passage quoted from p. 22, he will not deny it, inconsistent as it may seem with the general train of his reasoning.

The habits of my life for forty years, have given me a decided preference for agriculture; but, Sir, it is for an agriculture animated by a great demand; and, when I hear the sister employments depreciated which constitute that demand, I must readily confess that I am alarmed, lest the first and great basis of our national prosperity should suffer as much from its friends, as ever it did from enemies.

Mr. Spence gives the following definition of wealth; "Wealth is defined to consist in abundance of capital, of cultivated and productive land, and of those things which men usually esteem valuable. p. 11."

That abundance of cultivated and productive land is wealth, will not be easily controverted: but, let me be more explicit and affix to the word abundance, the idea of that abundance which we possess in England. Then, I presume, Mr. Spence will admit that this abundance has been created by the demand formed by manufactures and commerce, as forming two of the great parents of national consumption. This fact does away the peculiarity of one article in this definition. The other two, *capital and things usually esteemed*, belong equally to manufactures and commerce. This defini-

tion then, will not agree with the general clue of the reasoning that depreciates commerce and manufacture.

The same gentleman says, "Gold and silver are undoubtedly wealth, yet they are but a small portion of what has properly a claim to that title; and a nation which has abundance of gold and silver, is in fact, not richer than if it had none. It has paid an equal value of some other wealth for them. p. 20." There is much truth here, but it should be well discriminated. Gold and silver are expressly admitted to be wealth; but then, it is added, that a nation is not the richer for them. Is a man richer for having a grainery full of corn, far exceeding his own consumption? Why is he richer? Because he has that which will purchase every thing else. Then money is wealth for the same reason; and still more so with a nation, for foreigners will take your money, though not your paper, or corn.

The great importance of money would, perhaps, in no other circumstance be better understood, than by clearly analysing another observation of this writer, wherein he attributes all our wealth and greatness to the establishment of manufacturers as a distinct class. p. 24.

It would, however, lead me too far to give this, but if you reflect upon it, you will presently convince yourself that this step in the national progress depended absolutely on money, and could not have been taken without it.

But, Sir, it is time to come to facts, and experience; are there no facts to which we can refer? Has the progress of our commerce been so regular as not to afford some better data, than reasoning and supposition? I think a period may be found, in which a great decline in the exports and the imports of the kingdom did occur; and it seems more satisfactory to examine what were the consequences, than by any train of logical reasoning, to justify so enormous a paradox as the idea that we could now lose all our exports and imports with so small an inconvenience as you and Mr. Spence seem, in a measure, to suppose. Such a period did occur; and it has occurred but once, from 1698 to 1806. Through that long period the rise of export, and import, was gradual and almost regular, except during the American war. The exports then fell about one fourth, and it well deserves Mr. Spence's attention (for it is the circumstance to which he attaches the cure of the malady) that the imports fell nearly in an equal degree. Here then was a great experiment, and we have only to examine the result, in order to un-

derstand h
reasoning i
I was a fa
American v
perienced
on from
but a taste

1776

1777

1778

1779

1780

Average

The pro
pressed.

Com

1778

1779

1780

1781

1782

1783

from 30

years prec

and some

the stock

the prices

ceased to

police of

getting ric

farmers w

could fin

and numb

All lands

considera

was oblig

£500 a y

that am

Every sp

not a shi

taved. I

oil itself

fell from

to my kn

If it b

circumst

ted not

every we

the king

manufac

export t

fourth o

by a corr

* An

IX p. 3.

; lb.

understand how far it is safe to trust to logical reasoning in questions of political œconomy. I was a farmer through the whole of the American war, and long before it; and experienced evils of a very different complexion from any Mr. Spence supposes; it was but a taste of the dish which this gentleman

tells us may be rendered harmless. But forbid it policy, that it should ever come again to my table! A few circumstances will give an idea of distress well worth the attention of politicians. The price of corn was ruinously low.

	Wheat.	Rye.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.
1776	4 9½	3 4½	2 6½	1 10½	3 3½
1777	5 8½	3 6	2 6½	1 11½	3 6½
1778	5 3	3 6½	2 10	1 10½	3 5½
1779	4 2½	2 11	2 5½	1 9	3 0
1780	4 5½	2 9½	2 1½	1 7½	2 9½ *
Average	4 10½	3 2½	2 6	1 9¾	3 2½

The products of grass were equally depressed.

Combing Wool per tod of 28lb.

	s.	d.
1778	14	6
1779	13	6
1780	11	6
1781	10	6
1782	10	0
1783	14	0†

from 30 to 40 per cent. lower than for 40 years preceding †. Many farmers had 3, 4, and some even 5 years wool on hand—and the stock became so great as to keep down the prices several years after the cause had ceased to operate, thanks to the abominable police of our wool laws. The difficulty of getting rid of any live stock was great. The farmers were in such distress that labourers could find but a very partial employment, and numbers fell a burthen to the parishes. All lands not underlet before, sunk in rent considerably: an intimate friend of mine was obliged either to reduce a farm from £500 a year to £350, or suffer arrears to that amount; he preferred the former. Every species of improvement was arrested; not a shilling spent that could possibly be saved. No wonder that the price of the soil itself should be equally affected. Land fell from 30 to 20 years purchase: some was to my knowledge sold at 19.

If it be asked what occasioned so many circumstances marking distress, that admitted not of a doubt; I can only reply, that every well informed man at that time in the kingdom, attributed it to the decline of manufactures and foreign commerce. Our export trade did not sink more than one-fourth of the total; and this was attended by a corresponding fall in the imports, which

should according to Mr. Spence's principles have proved an immediate remedy: but no such matter; not the smallest effect to lessen the distress so universal in the agriculture of the kingdom. The decline in commerce and manufactures had an *immediate* effect in lowering prices, which could not be felt 6 months by any class in the state without lessening the consumption of fabrics—a reaction which again played back on the farmer, till the effect became a system of vibrations of saving from incapacity to consume. There was no visible or known transfer in consumption stated by Mr. Spence: the money or value before employed on foreign superfluities, was not transferred to different objects made at home; but the power, the means of consuming fell. Corn, cattle, and wool sunk in price, and the landlord instead of rent from many tenants, saw entries of arrears; the labourer idle, or working for low pay; the farmer with his products unsold; and the landlord with tax bills and arrears, were all people who would have spurned at the visions of comfort, had they been held forth in advice to *transfer consumption* from one object to another; *Mr. Politician, we spend all we receive; what would you have more?*

If the decline of one-fourth of our export trade (though accompanied by Mr. Spence's remedy of a decline in the imports also) had such an effect as every old man now living experienced in the American war, what should we have to expect at present from the loss of the whole! Far am I from asserting that ruin must be the consequence; but, thus much I may venture to assert, that it is not a speculation to be treated lightly, or contemplated with the complacency of political apathy; erroneous hope may be as mischievous as undue fear.

An observation is however necessary here, I do not conceive that the facts stated amount

* Annals Vol. IV. p. 391. † Annals Vol. IX p. 332.
‡ lb. p. 456.

to the least proof, that any naval war at present would be attended with such an effect; and this for reasons so obvious, that to enlarge upon them would be useless.

Before yourself, Sir, or Mr. Spence are ready to determine that the annihilation of commerce would not be attended with extremely pernicious effects, let us examine what it amounts to.

British produce and manufacture exported in

1804	-	-	-£40,349,642
1805	-	-	- 41,068,942
1806	-	-	- 43,242,176

Of which, produce makes about 2 millions*.

Imports into Great Britain in 1806.

Northern European produce	-£4,431,754
Southern European	- 2,642,740
American and colonial	- 12,085,899
Irish produce and manufactures	3,245,742
British fisheries	- 469,146
Prize goods	- 735,938
Sundries	- 1,482,870

Exclusive of East Indies† - 25,094,089
1807.

Imports from the East Indies } £
and China in 1804 ‡ - } 5,214,621

British and foreign shipping employed in the trade of Great Britain in 1806.

Entered inwards.	Ships.	Tons.
British	- 12,110§	1,482,412
Foreign	- 3,792	612,800

Tons of Shipping belonging to the Ports of the British Empire.

1794	-	- 1,589,758
1804	-	- 2,208,570¶

1806 Exported exclusive of produce - 41,242,176

Re exportation of imported commodities ** - 9,124,479

50,366,655

The exportation trade or foreign commerce of the kingdom, without saying any

* See the account ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, April 8, 1807.

† Account ordered to be printed April 8, 1807.

‡ Ordered to be printed April 18, 1806.

§ Navigated by 88,963 seamen.

¶ Account ordered to be printed April 8,

1806.

** Paper ordered to be printed the 18 April, 1806.

thing of imports, amounts to the value of fifty millions at the lowest, employs 12,000 ships, and near 90,000 seamen. Were it possible here to detail the innumerable links of this immense chain, which ties together the manufactures and commerce of the kingdom, and animates the exertion of every farmer in Britain, we should think that man bold, and that politician a daring one, who can speak lightly of such an annihilation, or can dream of rolling at pleasure, so mighty a tide into any new and imaginary channels.

Add the exports and imports together, the amount is

1806 Exports	-	-	- 43,242,176
Imports	-	-	- 25,094,089
China, &c. 1804	-	-	- 5,214,621

73,550,886

The imports must include the payment of the seamen, but not in the exports; half the amount at £50.

2,250,000

75,800,886

£10 per ton, estimated to last 12 years £1,235,343. We know not the proportion employed by foreign trade, if half, it will be *

617,671

76,418,557

It would demand too much time to carry the estimate as far as it would go, but whether it be 70 millions or 80, the conclusions must be nearly the same. It may be useful to consider any such amount in comparison with the grand and admitted basis of national wealth, the product of the soil. Let us call the land rent 35 millions, and suppose half to be grass, and half arable: the produce of grass is usually estimated at double the rent, that of arable was formerly supposed to be treble, but we will calculate at quadruple; then the produce of the former will be 35 millions, and of the latter 70, together 105†. The value imported and exported with the additions above noted, amount then to near three-fourths of the gross produce of the soil of England: 78 millions would be exactly so, and is more than double the land rent of the kingdom.

* In so rough an estimate it is not of consequence to be accurate, a slight inspection will shew the various items are omitted.

1,482,412 tons of shipping at

† The object before me is not an accurate estimate of products, but to accept one that has been referred to by other writers.

The immense vacuity which would be the result of cutting off our foreign commerce, Mr. Spence fills by a dash of his pen.

"If Buonaparté succeed in destroying our export trade, our import trade must fall with it; and exactly in proportion as the former suffers, so must the latter. It is this inevitable loss of our import trade, which will supply the remedy for any evils that may affect our manufacturing class, dependent on our export commerce. When we can no longer obtain the commodities with which foreign nations have been wont to supply us, we must necessarily seek for succedaneums at home, p. 68."

"For instance, if the consumers of the articles which we import and sell at home, to fifty millions, were to resolve no longer to consume them, is it not self-evident, that if they chose, they might take the place of our foreign customers, and purchase with the fifty millions thus saved, the goods to the same amount which we now export? p. 66."

The theory of the case here supposed (for purer theory never found its way into the pages of Utopia!) whatever ingenuity may be found in it, proceeds upon ideas more easy to trace on paper than to realise in practice. The writer delivers it as if difficulties were out of the question, difficulties, which, even upon his own principles, and granting his own facts, do not seem to be sufficiently considered; he remarks,

"In what, then, can the sums above this amount, which are spent by the numbers in this country, who have their £10,000 and £20,000 a year, be expended but in luxuries? And, as from this consideration, it is plain, that the population of the manufacturing class, at present occupied in providing necessaries, is fully equal to fabricate all that are wanted of this description, it follows, that the additional population of this class, can only be employed in the manufacture of new luxuries. p. 39."

It appears to me that Mr. Spence here answers himself: he states truly that the demand for necessaries being supplied, our manufacturers could only be employed in providing new luxuries, but by whom are these new luxuries to be demanded? Evidently by those who have saved the amount of our imports, that is to say, those who have drank foreign wines, and tea, and consumed sugar and spices, may instead thereof consume finer cloth, carpets, hats, sticks, and gloves, &c. Did the higher classes cease to consume foreign wines, tea, sugar, and spice at the American war? Without doubt they

consumed on the average proportionably to their receipts of income: when arrears took the place of rent they ate and drank less, but did not *transfer* their consumption of commodities which they wanted, to more cloth and kettles, and beef which they did not want. Nor could they have done it for a very plain reason; the lessened consumption followed the decline of income, which left them nothing to transfer. Mr. Spence ought to admit the justness of this remark, as he has with much truth observed on the mischief which would follow landlords hoarding instead of consuming.

"Let us suppose, that, patriotically induced by this reflection, they resolved not to spend, but to save the £1,000,000 which their revenue amounted to. Is it not self-evident, that all those members of the manufacturing and unproductive classes, who had, directly, or indirectly, been accustomed to draw the revenue destined for their subsistence, from the expenditure of this sum, would have their power of consuming the produce of the earth diminished by the whole amount of this £1,000,000? And if so, it follows that they would be obliged to use food, both less in quantity, and deteriorated in quality. The farmer consequently, could not sell so much of his produce, nor at so good a price as before, and thus he would be incapable of paying the rent, which he had been accustomed to pay, and, in the end, the land proprietor would be as much injured by this saving scheme, as any of the other classes of society. p. 34."

It is rather surprising that a writer of Mr. Spence's abilities, while so judicious a reflection passed in his mind, should not see how directly applicable it is against his own system. If landlords by hoarding or withdrawing from circulation, would thus injure manufacturers, and by consequence farmers and themselves, if by thus persisting in saving for five years, they would, as Mr. Spence in another place observes, have no income at all, does it not by fair parity of reasoning follow, that with drawing a large portion of commercial profit and circulation, would be attended with similar effects? The deduction is direct and decisive: the inconveniences would be the same; the stagnation similar; and consumption lessened in proportion to the amount withdrawn. This I conceive is one of the weakest links in the chain of his argument; the stagnation resulting from a decline of commerce is a rivation of income; consumption stagnates with income; and the first notice which the landlords would receive of a necessity of transferring their consumption from to-

reign to domestic commodities, would be the decline of their own incomes, being an inability to consume any thing in proportion to the amount of such declension. The loss is first felt, by merchants and master manufacturers; it descends through all the classes employed by them. The farmer is next affected; then all the labourers in husbandry; then landlords, and every class in the state who are benefited by their expenditure; and in this progress of degradation the ramifications on every side spread through a thousand different professions and employments, with an unceasing reaction. In such a state of things, to suppose that any of these classes can make a pause for consideration, and determine before hand to transfer their consumption from one object to another, is an idle delusion. Every man continues his accustomed consumption till his income lessens, and the only change that takes place is his expenditure lessening with his income. We have experienced the effects of exports and imports, lessening one fourth, what then would be the effect of their annihilation altogether. If the gross produce of cultivation be stated at 105 millions, and the gross amount of manufacture and commerce as far as foreigners are concerned at 76 millions; it will surely appear a paradox well calculated to make a plain man stare, to hear it asserted that 76 millions might be withdrawn from, or transferred in such circulation of 181 millions, and that so little mischief would be the result that friends to their country could view the operation without alarm. And I should conceive that the amazement of such a plain understanding would be increased, when the explanation is given—that those who drink tea might substitute sage or balm; that those who drink wine might drink water; that tobacco being a vile weed men might leave off smocking; in a word, that those who consume commodities because they want and desire

them, might become much wiser and consume other commodities which they neither want, nor desire. Such speculations may shew, and have shewn, what great talents can effect in confounding in the minds of readers *that have been talking prose all their lives without knowing it*, the plainest dictates of common sense. But such a play of parts may be classed with panegyrics on folly, or a fever.

But, I beg leave to take another measure of this object, which a remark of your's, Sir, brings to my mind. "In no one year of the late scarcity, the corn imported from all the foreign nations put together, was more than enough to supply our wants for one week." (*Vol. XII. p. 905*)

Now, this is so far from being accurate, that the error is enormous. The imports of wheat and flour (reduced to quarters) in 1800 was 1,384,345 quarters. In 1801, it was 1,464,518 quarters. Of the 10½ millions of our population, there may be 7 that feed on wheat; however, instead of 7 call the consumption of wheat 8 millions* of qrs. then *at a full consumption* in the last of those years, 1,464,000 persons lived on foreign corn; or a mean between one fifth, and one sixth of the total. The weekly consumption is 153,846 qrs. and consequently, we imported for above 9 weeks consumption, *at the average ratio of consuming*. But with wheat at £6 per qr. we may easily suppose that our import fed the nation during 11 or 12 weeks; to the great disgrace of the political system of this country †.

But let me further examine our importations. From 1781 to 1806 there have been imported 12,220,219 qrs. of wheat, and on an average of the 26 years 413,000 qrs. per annum. These gentlemen might therefore, be told that the manufacturers for exportation have been FED by foreign trade, Mr.

* At a qr. per head per ann.

Species.	† Corn imported in 1806.		At per Quarter.		Value.	
	Quantity.					
	Q. B.	s. d.			£. s. d.	
Barley	5385 5	38 6			10,367 6 3	
Beans	3406 3	43 9			7451 8 9	
Oats	510,242 3	25 8			654,811 8 10	
Pease	1514 4	43 6			3294 0 9	
Rye	829 5	47 4			1963 3 10	
Wheat	1,506,986 —	79 0			5,952,594 14 0	
Total	2,028,364 4				6,630,482 2 5	

How many reflections doth such a table suggest! Look at the countries around the Baltic.—Look at the wastes of Britain, and draw the conclusion.

Spence contends that their number certainly is not more than 500,000, probably not more than 300,000. Now 413,000 are fed with wheat imported, and the import of oats feeds a great number of other manufacturers, who must consequently be working for home consumption. *We do not, therefore, only feed ourselves, but we cloath and supply you with a large portion of your necessary fabrics; where is this transmutation of British corn into manufactures for exportation? If it be a transmutation, it is transmuting the corn brought from Prussia and Poland by foreign commerce: you are so unable to feed us, that you do not feed yourselves without our assistance. Our demand for the products of grass is so great, that if you supply it we must go to others for corn, not only to feed ourselves, but a large portion of those who manufacture for your necessary consumption.* Thus might the class employed on foreign supply retort on Mr. Spence.

The principal consumption of well paid manufacturers, so far as the landed interest is concerned, is in the products of grass land.

Beer is an article of consequence; but of corn imported barley is but a trifle.

If we are to lose our foreign trade we should look for compensation, not in *transferred consumption*, but in raising at home the commodities hitherto imported: corn to the amount of four millions sterling: 40 or 50,000 tons of hemp and flax, and a long list of other articles, the production of which would create a great and new circulation, however inferior it might be in amount to what we had lost.

An observation might be made here in reply, but so obvious and superficial, that I trust it would not be urged by the gentleman whose performance excited these remarks. It may, however, be said—that if the manufacturers working for export be fed with foreign corn, stop the trade and the consumption of English corn will at least remain the same, or, rather be increased by the amount of the reduced consumption of half a million of amply fed workmen turned into parish paupers: and something of this sort would be the case, were it a question of mouths only, and not of income. But, Sir, you well know that all these combinations and contrasts depend, not on numbers but on income, that is, on consumption. Forty millions sterling in exported fabrics, are £80 per head per annum to 500,000 persons employed to produce them. Deduct the very small proportion of materials in a really raw state, and the large remainder will, when reckoned to every man, woman, and child,

form an income (above £300 a year to a family of five) in which the consumption of corn will make but a paltry amount: at a quarter of wheat per head, or 5 quarters, it will be under £20 in above £300*.

But I must confess, Sir, that I want faith, in the power of Buonaparté to hedge in the cuckoo, as stopping trade has been called—nor, do I believe, that were America to join him, our trade would suffer in any degree that would *necessitate* us to make an inglorious or dangerous peace. If those manufacturers who have been consumers, not of our own, but of foreign corn, should become clamorous for peace, they will take the sure means to render a safe one impossible; and were they to be listened to by government in the conclusion of it, we should have far more reason to deprecate and condemn the commercial system, than ever the writings of Mr. Spence are likely to produce. Whatever the evils resulting from a loss of trade may prove—we must manfully resolve to bear them: but let not the people be deceived into the expectation that they would be light: they would be heavy enough; and disappointed hope ought not to be added to the burthen.

It would take too much time to expatiate on the folly and madness of that policy, which has during 26 years given to foreigners so much of the benefit from our manufactures and commerce, while our own land remains waste in space sufficient to produce ten times as much: and restricting the immediate benefit to the products of grass. Could we have imported milk and butter and mutton, our legislative system would doubtless have been equally exerted in giving to Germany and Poland that supply also, of our markets. A system so full of absurdity, and gross stupidity, that I cannot attribute the constant prosperity of this kingdom, in spite of such endeavours to counteract it, to any cause but the overflowing bounties of Divine Providence, which in favour of this happy country seems employed, not only in the diffusion of direct good; but to extract it even from the very evils brought on us by our own blind errors, and misconduct. If such a series of blessings as we have experienced, hath no effect in turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, we have as much cause for fear as hitherto for thanksgiving.

I intended to have troubled you with some remarks, on the third great maxim of

* I accept throughout this paper Mr. Spence's data—but it might easily be shewn that they demand much revision.

the Economistes, that all taxes fall on land, which I hold to be as erroneous as the rest; and which you have very judiciously departed from, Vol. XII. p. 721, by representing them as the fruit of land and LABOUR. But this letter has been extended to so unforeseen a length, that I shall trespass no longer on your patience.—I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient and very humble servant,

ARTHUR YOUNG.

*Bradfield Hall, }
Jan. 22, 1808. }*

IRELAND AS IT IS.

Vindex; Letter 4th.

SIR,—The security of property is so absolutely essential to the possession and maintenance of a free constitution, that, without it, civil liberty and popular rights would be idle phantoms, existing only in name. A government, that could dispose of the property of its subjects at pleasure, would have no difficulty in establishing itself independent of every species of control. Authority, without the means of supporting it, is dangerous only to the possessor; and a constitution, that withholds the dominion over these means from the executive power, best provides for the employment of them in the promotion of public objects and national interests. It is to the spirited resistance made, at all times, by our ancestors, against the arbitrary attempts of government to invade the security of private property, that we are indebted for that system of civil rights and political freedom, which is so justly the pride of this country, and so universally the envy of the other nations of Europe. Nay, the most essential part of our present constitution, the great council of the nation, originated with the Saxons, whose property in their possessions was absolute and allodial, vested wholly in themselves, and thoroughly independent of the paramount rights of any superior. The Normans modified the right by an alteration of the tenure. They secured to the individual his possessions, but subjected them to the operation of paramount rights and feudal conditions; yet, the property still remained, though in a qualified shape, guaranteed from invasion in any quarter, and creating that spirit of independence, which, after many struggles and various success, has at length terminated in the establishment of the wisest system of civil government and municipal law, that ever existed in any nation.—The security of property, therefore, is not more essential to private happiness than to public rights, and the principle of its legal inviolability, which

has been consecrated by the example and practice of so many ages, was never, at any period, so well understood or so scrupulously acted upon, as at present. Reposing under the shelter of equal law, the meanest subject is protected in his possessions, which cannot be wrested from him, even by the legislature, without a full and adequate equivalent. The same salutary influence of legislative justice and legal protection, which guards the property of the individual from violation, spreads a shield over the property of the public, or of public bodies. The property of the clergy, any more than that of the laity, cannot, consistently with this principle, be approached, except under the sanction of an act of the legislature, and for a just compensation. The right of the clergy to their tythes is of common law foundation, and consequently not to be affected, so far as the present possessors are concerned, in any other manner, than as any private property of an individual, which may be required for a public use, that is, upon a fair estimate of its value and an adequate equivalent. It is quite another question, how far it may or may not be desirable, to continue the compensation to the successors of the present incumbents, who have a property in possession in the revenues of their benefices. To indemnify the latter would be but an act of justice; to continue the equivalent, in the same proportions, to the former, must be a question to be determined by considerations of expediency.—Upon the score of right, the clergy of Ireland have as good a title to their tythes, as the land proprietors have to their estates. But this right vests, absolutely, in the present incumbents alone. As no clergyman can look upon himself, as heir or successor to any benefice, during the incumbency of the present possessor, no one can complain, if the legislature, in its justice and wisdom, should regulate the succession, in a manner most likely to promote the general interests of the church establishment. But it may be said, that, though no individuals have a vested right to the succession, the right is at all times vested in the whole body of the clergy, and that, therefore, any equivalent, which might be given to the present incumbent, ought to be continued to his successor, because he must be one of that body, in which the right at all times, resides. In admitting the aggregate right, it is not necessary, that we should subscribe to the individual advantage. If the title be in the whole body, and not in the single person, who may be appointed to succeed, it would follow, that the benefit of the suc-

cession
possibl
gregate
three t
there
nently
dertake
seven
there
maind
could
adding
under
howev
here,
the op
and to
grieva
this in
subject
disting
necess
1st. th
their p
ed op
mode
of pro
the gr
nation
the d
the co
exami
ticipat
name
been
is, the
right,
ercise
indivi
servic
equiv
prop
partic
perfo
same
has t
servic
absur
contr
In fac
lishin
bitrat
lastly
that
tythe
tion
any
unde
prop
be n
justi

[305]

cession ought to be extended, as much as possible, amongst the members of the aggregate body. When a benefice of two or three thousand pounds per annum falls in, there can be no doubt, that a person, eminently qualified, could be procured, to undertake the duty, with a revenue of five or seven hundred pounds per annum; and there can be as little question, that the remainder of the revenue of such benefice could be most advantageously employed, in adding to the amount of the small livings under one hundred pounds per annum. This, however, is not a subject to be discussed here, where the object is an inquiry into the operation and effect of tythes, in Ireland, and to ascertain the amount of popular grievance, that arises from that cause. In this investigation, the consideration of the subject naturally divides itself into three distinct points of view, in which it will be necessary to regard the question of tythes; 1st. the intrinsic oppression of tythes from their partial operation; 2dly. the aggravated oppression of tythes from the vexatious mode of collecting them and the exactions of proctors and tythe farmers; and 3dly. the grievous consequences, that result to the nation from their inequality of pressure, and the discouragement of agriculture, that is the consequence. But, before I proceed to examine either of these heads, I must anticipate an objection, which may be made, namely, that the property in tythes has been inalienably vested in the church, and is, therefore, not within the operation of that right, which the legislature constantly exercises, of disposing of the property of any individual, which may be necessary to the service of the state, upon giving a fair equivalent. Tythes are, in reality, a public property, assigned by the legislature to a particular body, as a remuneration for the performance of certain public services. The same authority, that conferred the property, has the power of regulating or altering the services to be performed; and it would be absurd to suppose, that it had not an equal control over the terms of remuneration. In fact, the parliament of Ireland, by abolishing tythes of agistment, first by an arbitrary vote of the house of commons, and lastly by the act of union, has clearly shewn, that the clergymen hold their property, in tythes, subject to the discretion and regulation of the legislature.—In order to form any adequate idea of the severity of tythes, under the first point of view, in which I propose to look at their operation, it will be necessary to consider them in relation to justice and to expediency; that is, as to

their aggravated pressure upon a small part of the surface of the country, and as to the policy of leaving the particular classes, which, at present, bear most of the burthen, still liable to such an incumbrance. The origin of tythes lies in those remote ages, when the produce of agriculture constituted the principal, if not the only, source of national income. The provision, therefore, for a national clergy could not otherwise have been procured, than by subjecting the profits of land to some charge for their support. As rents were then paid in kind, so also were tythes. Such was the origin of the establishment. Possibly the example of the jewish institution might have influenced our ancestors, in regulating the rate of this charge; and, though the divine right was never dreamed of, as is abundantly manifest from the silence of the gospel, the practice of the primitive church, and the glaring difference between the jewish and christian establishments, it is yet natural to suppose, that the proportion was adopted from the institutions of that nation. Thus did tythes originate. From the circumstances of the times and the rate of contribution, imposed upon the only source of income then known, we may collect, that tythes were, in their first institution, intended to be a provision for the ministers of a national religion, proportioned to the respectability of their situations and to the extent and importance of the benefits, to be derived to society from their professional exertions and instruction, and that they were intended equally and impartially to affect all property. As every individual in the community participated in the services of the clergy, so none could reasonably object to contribute their full and fair proportion to their support. The individual, who contributed, was amply requited in the pastoral attentions and spiritual edification of the order he supported. This was all fair and just; both parties were punctual, and both were satisfied. The consideration followed the value, which of course must have preceded the consideration. The clergyman received, without deduction, the portion allotted to him by the state, and the layman was easily reconciled to a sacrifice of a small portion of his temporal effects, to reward the services of those, whose duty it was to watch over his eternal interests. But how different must the case be in a country, where the great mass of the population is of a different persuasion from the clergy, for whose support tythes are levied; in which, neither the whole of the property, nor the whole produce of the land, is subjected to the charge; in which,

those who enjoy the advantage of the services of the clergy, contribute but a very small portion of the public provision for the establishment, whilst the greatest portion of the burthen bears altogether upon the poorer classes, who never derive any benefit at all from the establishment? Here consideration must be raised as the value sinks. The spirit of monopoly and the dæmon of bigotry may, and must, often go hand in hand, and unite to persecute, as well as to collect. The individual, who is assessed, looks upon it as a severity, to be compelled to contribute, what produces him no correspondent advantage. His ingenuity is exerted to evade, his prejudices instigate him to defeat the claim, and every effort of fraud, artifice, and intimidation will, almost naturally, be essayed to render the charge upon himself light, and to the clergyman unproductive. Mutual interest, the only sure basis of reciprocal integrity in transactions, that regard property, cannot mediate, and the person, who is constrained to pay for what he does not, cannot, or will not, receive, easily persuades himself of the propriety of endeavouring to reduce the consideration to the standard of the value. The clergyman procures his stipend without satisfaction, and it is given with reluctance. The people loudly murmur, whilst their turbulence and often outrageous conduct, become a source of general apprehension and universal complaint. All parties are discontented, and the hopeless evil, that generates this extremity of dissatisfaction, and undermines the peace, good temper, and virtue of society, grows too inveterate to yield, but to the wisdom of legislative interference.—This short sketch will be sufficient to convey some idea of the state of Ireland, as to tythes and the oppression, arising from the intrinsic defects of the present system. The abolition of tythes of agistment has narrowed their operation, from extending over the whole surface of the country, to that limited portion of it, which is wrought with much labour and heavy expence, in the various processes of agriculture, I mean tillage. The necessity of indemnifying themselves for the deficiency of revenue, created by the exemption of pasture and feeding grounds from the operation of tythes, has constrained the clergy to raise their rates, upon the small portion of land, that remains subject to their charges, infinitely higher, than it would otherwise be desirable, or perhaps prudent, for them to attempt. And, as the rates are always regulated by the value of the particular crop, and potatoes yield a more pro-

fitable return than any other species of culture, potatoes are consequently estimated higher in the clergyman's book of rates, than any other crop. Thus the average charge for tythes of potatoes is fifteen shillings per acre, for wheat thirteen, barley thirteen, bere thirteen, oats eight, and meadow land five. These charges sometimes vary considerably in different districts, but the variation is, as often above, as below, the averages here stated. Barley, for instance, and potatoes are often charged one guinea, and one guinea and a half, in particular places, per acre. Such local exorbitance, however, is only to be incidentally noticed. The object of this paper is not to exaggerate grievances, but to collect undeniable data, and make them the foundation of general and indisputable results. The various averages above stated will give one general average of eleven shillings per acre. The amount of revenue of the Irish church establishment has usually been estimated at half a million annually; but without imputing any sinister motives to those, who estimate it at that sum, and who take infinite pains to represent the Irish clergy, as in a state of comparative poverty, I must be allowed to carry my estimate of the annual amount of tythes much higher. I believe it to be little short of one million, but I shall take it, for the sake of avoiding all possibility of cavil, at eight hundred and twenty thousand pounds. Now by applying my general average charge per acre to this sum, that is, by dividing this sum by eleven shillings, we shall find that the whole number of acres, liable to the charge, does not exceed fifteen hundred thousand, five hundred thousand of which are cultivated by the labouring poor, which, at fifteen shillings per acre, pay to the establishment three hundred and seventy thousand pounds, being nearly one half of its whole revenue. There is but one other datum necessary, towards a clear conception of this question, in relation to the justice of the case. The whole surface of Ireland is estimated at fifteen millions of acres. The following results then follow obviously. One tenth of the superficial contents of Ireland bears the whole weight of the tythe establishment; one third of that proportion, being one thirtieth of the whole, is charged with nearly one half of the whole tythe establishment; that proportion of the population, which has no property, is compelled to pay to clergymen, from whom they derive no advantage, nearly one half of their whole provision, levied off one thirtieth of the surface of Ireland, whilst the remainder of the population of that country, possessing the

whole
more t
their o
of the
Is it
to pro
things
of con
rection
any re
pedier
ment
ther c
to con
vexati
lected
gener
to the
know
gainin
action
of wh
are m
his o
event
in his
in su
rogat
his c
both
to em
it is,
rishie
his in
toget
lets
farm
to th
calles
nistr
paris
adju
proc
his e
paris
no j
tor,
an
rishie
a cle
sary
the
is co
proc
paris
the
toil
cula
regi
in
the

309]

whole of the property in it, contribute little more than the other half of the provision for their own clergy, from twenty-nine thirtieths of the superficial contents of the country. Is it necessary to add another observation to prove the iniquity of such a state of things? Would it not be an insult to a man of common sense, to attempt to give a direction to his feelings or his indignation, by any remarks, calculated to impress the expediency of some modification? This statement speaks for itself, and requires not farther comment or illustration.—I come now to consider the grievances, arising from the vexatious manner, in which tythes are collected in Ireland, first premising, that, in general, these vexations are not imputable to the clergy, for, if the real fact were known, it would appear, that, so far from gaining, they lose by most of those transactions, which constitute the oppressions, of which so many and so just complaints are made. The clergyman cannot manage his own concerns in tythes, because, in the event of litigation, he cannot be a witness in his own cause, and a direct interference, in such worldly transactions, would be derogatory from the character and sanctity of his official functions. He is, therefore, both from feeling and from necessity, obliged to employ agents to manage his business, and it is, not unfrequently, the fault of his parishioners, by their harrassing opposition to his interests, that he withdraws himself altogether from any concern with them, and lets the tythes of his benefice to a tythe farmer. When a clergyman does not resort to this course, he employs an agent, who is called a proctor, to superintend the administration of his temporal concerns in the parish, in the collection of tythes and the adjustment of a composition for them. The proctor is usually allowed ten per cent. by his employer, upon the gross income of the parish. If this were all, there would be no just ground of complaint. But the proctor, not content with this allowance, levies an infinitely larger income from the parishioners, under the head of fees. To give a clear view of this point, it will be necessary to state, briefly, the manner, in which the business of the composition for tythes is conducted. In the spring of the year, the proctor and his assistants make a tour of the parish, in order to estimate, by inspection, the growing hopes of the husbandman's toil. The value, they set upon each particular crop, is set down in a book, the black register of their extortions; and the entries in this book govern their conduct, when they come to regulate the composition in

each particular case. Before the harvest is gathered in, a meeting of the parishioners is summoned to attend the proctor, and often the clergyman, for the purpose of tythe letting. Each individual agrees to a composition for his own tythes, and, as a year's time is generally given for the payment, he passes a promissory note for the amount, first paying the proctor his fees. It should be observed, however, that, when the owner of the crop refuses to agree to the composition demanded, his tythes are sold to another person. There is no such practice, as setting out the tythe for the clergyman to draw it. If two or three, in a parish, were to give notice to that effect, it would be considered a conspiracy against the clergyman, and ample damages would be recoverable. The fees of the proctor, to which he can have no legal right, he being the servant of the parson and sufficiently paid by his employer, amount to ten per cent. nominally upon the composition, but infinitely exceed that sum by means of his fraud and exactions. Every sum, under ten shillings, compounded for tythe, he charges as ten; and every sum, over ten and under twenty, he charges as twenty, so that by rating all the intermediate sums, as the decimals next above them, and imposing a fee upon each, as for such decimal, he levies an exorbitant average of direct and compound per centage, of not less than twenty per cent. upon the whole amount of the composition. The tythe farmer also following up the principle, upon which he rents a parish, disposes of the tythes to the highest bidder. In his train are valuers, bidders, canters and process servers, and the whole tribe of popular pests. The proctor strips, but the tythe farmer scourges his victims. Should the owner of the crop be disposed to compound for his tythes, at any reasonable rate, a bidder is at hand to enhance the price; should he hesitate to raise his proposal to the advanced offer, a canter steps in, and intercepts the natural claim, which the cultivator has, to become the purchaser of the fruits of his own industry. So that, whether compounding or not compounding, between the bidders puffing, the canters unprincipled interference, and the exorbitance of the tythe farmer, the husbandman is sure to be the sacrifice. Whenever a parish is let, by the clergyman, to a tythe farmer, he uniformly reserves the whole income, which he antecedently derived from it, deducting only the allowance of ten per cent. usually given to proctors. In a parish, so circumstanced, the profits of the tythe farmer arise principally from the plunder of the people. The

clergyman continues to receive the same amount of income, but his parishioners are subjected to contributions, commensurate with the avarice and rapacity of his representative, the tythe farmer. Twenty per cent. falls infinitely short of the amount of such exactions, which frequently equal, and sometimes exceed, the income reserved by the clergyman. It will be obvious from this, that, at the very lowest calculation, an addition of one fifth is thus made, to the burthen of tythes, not for the support of the clergy, but for the advantage of those miscreants, who so unfeelingly traffic upon the distresses of their native country. The evil, however, does not stop here. Not content with the allowance made by the clergyman, equal to his proctor's salary, and the amount of his exactions in the gross, the tythe farmer swells the black list of his enormities, by exacting the same amount of fees as the proctor. Enough has now been stated to enable any man of common sense, employing only the most superficial observation, to estimate the average of the aggregate and arbitrary contributions, wrung from the agriculture of the country and the industry of the poor, by these vile agents of popular grievances, the tythe farmers and proctors. The allowance from the clergyman to his proctor is ten per cent., which, with twenty per cent., the estimated amount of his illegal fees, gives him a revenue of thirty per cent. upon that proportion of the tythe establishment, which is managed by him. The tythe farmer, on the other hand, has the same profits, under the same heads, with the addition of at least twenty per cent., the lowest profit which he can derive from his farm in the tythes. Taking the profits of the proctor, therefore, at thirty per cent., and those of the tythe farmer at fifty per cent., the aggregate of both is eighty, which gives a general average, upon all the tythes in the kingdom, of forty per cent., as the measure of their oppression. This subject will appear with more cogency by reducing these general statements to a definite result in specific sums. Thus an establishment of eight hundred and twenty thousand pounds, at forty per cent., yields three hundred and fifty thousand pounds to proctors and tythe farmers; and, of this sum, one hundred and forty thousand pounds are paid by the labouring classes. It would be idle to weaken this case by superfluous declamation or argument. The melancholy picture of popular suffering, exhibited in this detail, produce no conviction of the magnitude of the grievance and the urgency of redress, no human colouring can give it a more imposing form,

or more expressive features. The characters are so legible and distinct, that even he who runs, may read, and the most transient glance must carry conviction to any susceptible mind.—I am disposed to think, that even the deputation, from the self-constituted Hibernian society, though wholly intent upon schemes of evangelical amelioration, could not have overlooked the evidence of temporal misery presented in every stage of their rapid progress through Ireland. It is true, these gentlemen travelled with such velocity, and were so exclusively taken up with the importance of their mission, that they may not, possibly, have been as observant, as men, who should mix, considerations of sublunary comforts, with their views for promoting the spiritual welfare of a nation. Yet, if they did not resign themselves to actual slumbers, or to religious reveries, the moment they entered the mail coach, which alone could have enabled them to travel over so large a space, in so short a time, if their eyes were competent to the ordinary functions of organs of vision, or their minds susceptible of common impressions, they must have perceived enough to satisfy them of the practical misery of the country, notwithstanding their spiritual proscription of the great mass of its inhabitants. Of all the publications upon the state of Ireland, that I have seen, the report of a deputation, from the Hibernian society, is the most reprehensible and mischievous. It is from the first to the last an uninterrupted tissue of ignorance, presumption, bigotry, and intolerance. The individuals, who composed that deputation, may be good and well intentioned men, as well as the misguided members of the society, that deputed them to their mission. But, surely, the abstract merit of good intention cannot sanctify the actual violation of every principle of candor, moderation, and decency. If this assuming deputation had laid in their claim to inspiration, they might have some colour of claim to the credit, which they confidently expect to be given to their report. But, without the agency of the Divine Spirit, it is impossible, that it should be exempted from the application of those rules of rational consideration, which decide upon the merits of all human productions. The deputation set out from Dublin on their progress, on the thirty-first of last July, and after visiting Kilkenny, Clonmel, Waterford, Cork, Limerick, Gort, Tuam, Armagh, Dundalk, and Drogheda, they returned on the nineteenth of August to Dublin, after having performed a journey of between eight and nine hundred miles, in

twenty
every
time,
transit
form
the
would
his cha
sitive
out co
profes
fide p
appear
to the
any re
religio
deputa
for its
more
exclus
produ
mined
British
every
habitu
the re
tice I
me, fo
the gr
on the
howe
I felt
enoug
of see
of the
rious
timel
thorit
made
will,
those
they
const
of the
ple, c
tifiab
comm
leave
prese
upon
other
after
ances
order
and d
mod
of th
and c
I am
8th,

twenty days. It will, surely, be obvious to every unprejudiced mind, that, in so short a time, and in the precipitancy of such a rapid transit through a country, no idea could be formed of the exterior manners, still less of the internal principles of a people, which would warrant any person, having a regard for his character or for truth, in making any positive assertion upon the subject, even without committing the principles of a society, professing to have been formed for *bonâ fide* public purposes. In reality, the report appears to have been drawn up with a view to the objects of the society, but without any reference whatever to the actual state of religion in Ireland, and the mission of the deputation was adopted purely as a sanction for its publication. The fabricators of this more than monkish document of religious exclusion never once thought, that their production would be ever minutely examined, and trusted to the credulity of the British public, which swallows with avidity every tale respecting Ireland, and to the habitual apathy of those, acquainted with the real state of that country.—But the notice I have taken of this report, has diverted me, for the present, from the consideration of the grievous effects of the operation of tythes on the agriculture of Ireland. I could not, however, resist the impulse of indignation, I felt, at finding a few enthusiasts, daring enough to put up a whole nation to the ban of sectarian interdiction. The officiousness of these zealots will be productive of serious consequences, if not restrained by the timely interposition of some competent authority. The few observations, that I have made upon their presumptuous publication, will, I hope, have the effect of inducing those, who may see them, to reflect, before they receive the *ipse dixit* of a body, so constituted and conducted, as the criterion of the religious state of a calumniated people, or a proof of the impartiality and justifiable zeal of an officious and intolerant communion of sectarists. I shall take my leave of these evangelising gentry, for the present, having already encroached too far upon your indulgence, but shall seize another opportunity, with your permission, after I shall have detailed the actual grievances of Ireland, to resume this subject, in order to expose the absurdity, infatuation, and dangerous tendency of the projects, and modes proposed for executing the projects, of this intemperate and intolerant society, and of their post travelling missionaries.—I am, Sir, &c.—VINDEY.—*London, Feb. 8th, 1808.*

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

ENGLAND.—*Order in Council, relating to Portugal and the Brazils, dated Jan. 6, 1808.*

At the Court at the Queen's Palace, the 6th of January, 1808. present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.—Whereas it is expedient, in the present state of the subjects of her Most Faithful Majesty, and during the interruption in commercial correspondence between Great Britain and Portugal, that claims should be permitted to be given for Portuguese property brought in and detained by his Majesty's ships of war and privateers; his Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that claims for Portuguese property, given by persons duly authorised by the owners, or by the Consul or other person authorised by the Portuguese Minister resident at this Court, shall be admitted in the High Court of Admiralty; and it is further ordered, that immediate restitution shall pass of all such property as shall appear by the bills of lading or other documents found on board Portuguese ships, coming from Portuguese settlements to the ports of Portugal, to belong to her Most Faithful Majesty, or to any of her subjects residing at the date of this order, in the Brazils, or in any foreign settlement belonging to her crown, or in England, or in any country in amity with his Majesty, upon a general claim for every such ship and goods, given by the consul under the authority aforesaid; and it is further ordered, that the property of the subjects of her Most Faithful Majesty, at the date of this order, residing in Portugal either belonging to them separately, or jointly with subjects residing in the Brazils, or other places beforementioned, shall be pronounced to belong as claimed, upon a general claim given for the same on board such Portuguese ships as aforesaid; and it is further ordered, that the property last-mentioned, as well as all other property, under private claims already given or to be given, and pronounced to be Portuguese property, and belonging to persons resident in Portugal at the date of this order, shall remain subject to his Majesty's further orders; and, in the mean time, shall be put into the joint custody of agents to be named on behalf of his Majesty, and on behalf of the Portuguese Minister resident at this court, or of any claimant; and that such parts thereof as are perishable, or which it may be otherwise expedient to sell, shall be sold by the aforesaid agents, under commissions to be issued by the High Court of Ad-

miralty, and the proceeds thereof deposited in the said court:—And the Right Honourable the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury, his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and the Judges of the High Court of Admiralty and Courts of Vice-Admiralty, are to take the necessary measures herein as to them shall respectively appertain.—W. FAWKENER.

FRANCE.—*Commercial Decree, signed Napoleon, and dated at the Thuilleries, Jan. 11, 1808.*

Napoleon, &c. upon the report of our Minister of Finances, seeing our decrees of the 23d November and 11th December, 1807; with the concurrence of our Council of State we have decreed and do decree as follows:—Art. 1. When a vessel shall enter into a French port, or in that of a country occupied by our armies, any man of the crew, or a passenger, who shall declare to the principal of the Custom House, that the said ship comes from England or her colonies or countries occupied by English troops, or that it has been visited by an English vessel, shall receive a third part of the produce of the net sale of the ship and cargo, if it is known that his declaration is exact.—Art. 2. The principal of the Custom House, who shall receive the declaration mentioned in the preceding article, shall, in conjunction with the Commissary of Police, who shall be called on for that purpose, and the two principal custom house officers of the port, shall cause each of the crew and passengers to undergo, separately, the interrogatory prescribed by the second article of our decree of the 23d November, 1807.—Art. 3. Any functionary or agent of government, who shall be convicted of having favoured the contravention of our decrees of the 23d of November and 17th December, 1807, shall be prosecuted in the criminal court of the department of the Seine, which shall be formed into a special tribunal for this purpose, and punished, if convicted, as if guilty of high treason.—Art. 4. Our ministers are charged, each in his respective department, with the execution of the present decree.

HOLLAND.—*Decree against Sweden, signed by the King of Holland, and dated on the 18th of January, 1808.*

Louis Napoleon, by the grace of God and the constitution of the kingdom, King of Holland, and Constable of France.—Whereas we have received information that the orders adopted relative to the blockade of the British islands, have not been carried in-

to execution with like force against Swedish ships; and whereas this kingdom is equally at war with Sweden and England,—We have decreed, and hereby decree as follows:—

Art. I. Every Swedish ship which shall enter the ports of this kingdom shall be immediately seized, and also all Swedish merchandize shall be confiscated.—II. All Swedish subjects, who may have heretofore exercised diplomatic functions within our kingdom, or who may have served as consuls or commercial agents, and who still remain in Holland, are required to leave the kingdom immediately upon the publication of this decree.—III. All other Swedish subjects who may be found in our ports, or other parts of our kingdom, shall immediately be arrested, and treated as prisoners of war.—IV. The measures at present in force for the blockade of the British islands, shall, in like manner, and without exception, be made applicable to Sweden.—V. Our ministers of finance, justice, and police, are charged with the execution of the present decree, which shall be proclaimed at all places where its publication may be necessary.

PRUSSIA.—*Declaration against England. Dated at Munich, Dec. 1, 1807.*

The King being obliged, by the 27th article of the treaty of peace of Tilsit, concluded on the 9th of July, 1807, to shut, without exception, the Prussian ports and states against the trade and navigation of England, as long as the present war lasted between England and France, his Majesty has not hesitated to take progressively the most appropriate measures to fulfil his engagements.—In directing these measures, his Majesty did not dissemble the prejudice and loss which would result to the commerce of his dominions in general and that of his subjects, who, by a long series of misfortunes, have acquired new rights to his paternal solicitude and benevolence; but his Majesty yielded to the consolatory hope, that the mediation offered by Russia to England, by accelerating the return of a definitive peace between G. Britain and France, would soon bring about an order of things more congenial to the particular interests of each power.—The King has been deceived in his just expectation; the events that have taken place since, and which are too well known to render it necessary to recapitulate them, far from bringing the so much desired period of general peace nearer, have only placed it at a greater distance.—All communication is broken off between Russia and England. The declaration of his Majesty the Emperor

[317]

of all the Russias, published on the 26th Oct. proves that there is no longer any relation between those two powers. His Prussian Majesty, intimately connected by all his relations with the cause and system of the continental neighbouring and friendly powers, has no other rules of conduct than his duties founded upon the interests of his states, and the obligation contracted by a solemn treaty. —Conformably to these principles his Majesty, setting aside those considerations which he had hitherto respected, in the vain hope for a speedy general pacification; and having refused, since the mission of Lord Hutchinson, to receive at his court any English diplomatic agent, has just ordered his legation at London to quit England as soon as possible, and return to the Continent. —His Majesty the King of Prussia, in making known the resolutions which his engagements and the interest of his monarchy impose upon him as a duty, declares by these presents, that, till the restoration of a definitive peace between the two belligerent powers, there shall be no relation between Prussia and England.—FREDERICK WILLIAM.

PORTUGAL.—*Decree by General Junot for confiscating English property.*—Dec. 4, 1807.

All goods, jewels, and silver, as well as moveable and landed property of any nature whatsoever, belonging to any individual subject to Great Britain, found in any territory of the Portuguese dominions, shall be confiscated.—All goods of British manufacture, of any kind whatsoever, shall be also confiscated.—It is expressly ordained, that any person of whatever class, who shall have in his possession any sum or goods belonging to subjects of Great Britain, shall appear and declare the same in the course of three days, at the Secretary's Office, M. Legoy, appointed commissary *ad interim*, whose residence is at No. 10, opposite the Fountain of the Loretto; and in the interior parts of Portugal these declarations are to be made before the magistrate of the place.—Any person who shall not make a true and exact declaration, shall forfeit ten times the sum of the object so declared, and shall receive besides corporal punishment, if the object should deserve such.—Any goods or property which may have been any ways concealed by either Portuguese or French merchants, or those of any other nation, shall be declared in the same manner under the like penalties.—The administrator general of the finances, and the regency council, are charged with the execution of this decree.

PORTUGAL.—*Proclamation of the Inquisitor General. Dated at Lisbon, under the Seal of the Holy Office, Dec. 22, 1807.*

Don Joseph Maria de Mello, titular bishop of Algalva, inquisitor-general of this kingdom, member of her majesty's council, and her confessor.—To all the faithful of the holy church, health, peace, and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour and God. —The place of inquisitor general of this kingdom which we occupy, unworthy of it as we are; the holy episcopal character with which we are invested; the exemplary zeal with which the most eminent and venerable cardinal patriarch of Lisbon has just recommended, with so touching an unction, in his last pastoral letter, the preservation of tranquillity, peace, and Christian union, necessary in all times, and above all in the present; all these considerations impose upon us the duty of concurring on our side, and as far as we can, in a salutary object, and without which we cannot hope for any happiness either upon earth, or, which ought more to concern us, in the life to come. We address them to all the faithful of the holy church, to the inhabitants of this city and kingdom, we conjure them to be attentive and docile to the wise and pacific instructions of their venerable father and pastor, in a circumstance which concerns their present fate and their eternal happiness. We can do nothing better than to recall to them the paternal advice of that great prelate. Let them consider the situation in which we are, the favours which the Divine Goodness has heaped upon us, in the midst of our tribulations: let them bless God in all things; let them adore with an humble and contrite heart the immutable decrees of Providence, and let them be grateful for the innumerable benefits we have received from his all-powerful hand.—Let us reckon amongst these signal benefits, the peace and good order which have and do reign in this kingdom since a great army has come to our succour.—We are certain of our happiness if we know how to profit by it—we enjoy equal security both in our houses and out.—Let us not forget that we owe these advantages to the zeal and activity of the general in chief who commands us, and whose virtues we have long known; that the army which is in the midst of us is that of his Majesty the Emperor of the French and King of Italy, Napoleon the Great; that that Monarch has been sent by God to protect religion, and render people happy; that he will pour upon us the blessings of peace, if we love each other with fraternal charity—that by that means reli-

gion and its ministers will always be respected, and that in fine we shall enjoy all sorts of happiness if we shew ourselves worthy of such great protection. It is thus that we ought to conduct ourselves to accomplish faithfully the precepts of the Lord, whocommands us to obey power, not through fear, but through a duty of conscience.—Let us incessantly have before our eyes the touching exhortations which the venerable pastor of this city and diocese has addressed to his flock, to unite them in Christian charity, and to obtain peace and repose, of which we have so much need; and because that object is of the greatest importance, even for the preservation of the purity of our faith, we conjure all the deputies of the council general of inquisition and other ministers of the holy office, to unite their zeal to ours to maintain and consolidate the public tranquillity.—We recommend it especially to all the regulars in general, and to each in particular, to give, in all circumstances, the example of perfect submission, as it becomes the ministers of a God of Peace, who offer daily the sacrifice of propitiation, and who ought to be models of evangelical perfection to the people.—We exhort them to recall without ceasing to the faithful their duties, and above all to impress them with this truth, that there never can be too much peace and union. And in order that our letter may reach all the tribunals of inquisition in the kingdom, we have caused it to be stuck up and published in the churches of our district, in the accustomed form.

DENMARK. — DISPATCHES PUBLISHED BY DENMARK, RELATIVE TO THE COPENHAGEN EXPEDITION.—PUBLISHED IN JANUARY, 1808.

Extract of a Report from M. Rist, formerly Charge d'Affaires from Denmark to the English Court, to the Minister of State, Count Bernstorff.—London, 27th Sept. 1807.

It was probably to give more weight to those considerations, which Mr. Canning proposed to me, by reading to me yesterday his first minute of the proposition of the Court of London, that he thought it right to add to a brief exposure of the consequences which the refusal on our part to treat would be attended with. He then read to me the following five menaces.—It contained—1. The confiscation of all the vessels already detained, and yet to be detained. 2 The capture of our colonies. 3. The destruction

of our trade. 4. The possibility of being obliged to introduce Swedish troops into Copenhagen. 5. The necessity which might arise of rewarding and indemnifying his Swedish Majesty with the possession of Norway.—Mr. Canning judged it fit to leave out these menaces in the copy of the verbal note which he sent me.

Extract of a Report from the Same to the Same. London, Oct. 2, 1807.

I thought Mr. Merry had taken his departure, when he called on me yesterday, and told me, that intelligence, received by government, had retarded his departure, and made Mr. Canning wish to see me once more before he dispatched him. I accordingly waited on the minister, accompanied by Mr. Merry. The object of the interview was to acquaint me that a messenger, arrived this morning, had brought the confirmation of the disposition of his Swedish Majesty to co-operate with his Britannic Majesty for the common interest, in case that his assistance should be wanted; in other words, that Swedish troops were ready to replace those of the English government in Zealand, if the latter were obliged, on account of the capitulation, as another destination, to evacuate that island. Mr. Canning concluded by proposing to me to avail myself of the departure of Mr. Merry to press my Court to accede to an arrangement, the refusal of which would unavoidably be followed by the Swedish co-operation, and to represent to my Court the urgent necessity of coming speedily to some preliminary accommodation.

Letter from Count Bernstorff, Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Baron Wretstedt, First Secretary of the Cabinet of his Swedish Majesty.—Kiel, Oct. 17th, 1807.

Permit me, sir, to apply direct to you, to require of you officially an explanation, which it is important for my Court to obtain in an authentic manner. The English government thought proper to make a proposition, founded in part on the threat of a co-operation of Sweden in the hostile measures of Great Britain against Denmark. The cabinet of London dares to assert, that his Swedish Majesty has offered to cause the English troops in Zealand to be replaced by part of his own troops, in case that the former should be obliged to evacuate that island.

To be continued.